THE EMPIRE CLUB ADDRESSES
1949-50

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1949unse

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

H. G. COLEBROOK
PRESIDENT OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA FOR
1949-1950

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE
YEAR 1949-50

Forty-seventh year of Issue

GOD SAVE THE KING

T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LTD.,
TORONTO, CANADA.

Copyright, Canada, 1950
The Empire Club of Canada

YEAR BOOK PUBLISHING COMMITTEE
1949-50

John William Griffin (Chairman)
Ernest Miles

PRINTED AND BOUND IN CANADA
T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED, TORONTO

"OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE"

Year 1949-1950

Honorary President,
HIS EXCELLENCY, FIELD MARSHAL,
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF TUNIS, G.C.B.,
GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF CANADA.

Officers:

President: H. G. COLEBROOK
First Vice-President: SYDNEY HERMANT
Second Vice-President: WARREN B. HASTINGS
Third Vice-President: R. FORD RALPH
Secretary: LIEUT.-COL. JOHN HYDE BENNETT, V.D. (Deceased), ERNEST MILES
Honorary-Treasurer and Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, C.A.
Honorary Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, F.C.A.

Executive Committee:

COL. F. F. ARNOLDI, D.S.O.
H. C. BOURLIER
BRIG. COLIN A. CAMPBELL, O.B.E., D.S.O.
S. S. FLETCHER
FRANK T. GEROW
JOHN W. GRIFFIN
D. H. GIBSON
HORACE HARPHAM
GEORGE HARDY
NORMAN A. KEYS, K.C.
JAMES H. JOYCE
G. A. LASCELLES
J. MORGAN
SQ. L. NORMAN A. NUNN
J. P. PRATT, K.C.
JOHN WM. PERRY
CDR. R. H. STOKES-REES, R.N.

Immediate Past President:
THOS. H. HOWSE

Past Presidents:
TRACEY E. LLOYD
MAJOR F. L. CLOUSE
MAJOR JAMES BAXTER, M.C.

The Telegram

The President and Past President Dr. Elias Clouse

On February 23rd, 1950, Dr. Elias Clouse, President of The Empire Club of Canada, 1909-10, received the congratulations of the President and members on entering his 95th year.

EXCERPT FROM "ORIGIN AND OBJECTS OF THE EMPIRE CLUB" PUBLISHED IN THE YEAR BOOK FOR 1903-1904

On November 18th, 1903, a small meeting was held in Webb's Restaurant, Toronto, mainly on the initiative of Lieut.-Col. James Mason, for the purpose of preliminary discussion. The Chairman in a brief speech pointed to the desirability of an organization, following the plan of weekly luncheons, to be addressed by prominent men, or men speaking with authority upon the issues of the day, and having also a distinctive basis of British Unity in its work and policy.

A sub-Committee met on the following day and appointed . . . . . a Committee to draft a Constitution.

The meeting at which these principles and rules were approved and organization effected was held at the Luncheon hour on November 25th, in Webb's Restaurant, with some seventy gentlemen present..........after a discussion of various proposed names..........The Empire Club of Canada..........was approved by a large majority.

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY

AND

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society of London, England, and The Empire Club of Canada at Toronto were both founded for a single purpose and with a common aim:—The strengthening of the bonds of unity within the Empire. This mutual objective is prosecuted with vigorous enthusiasm by the members of these organizations on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

CONTENTS

FRONTISPIECE - - - - - - - - *facing title*

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1949-1950 - v

CONGRATULATIONS - - - - *facing page seven*

AIMS AND AFFILIATIONS - - - - - - - - ix

GEORGE McCULLAGH
"Testing Time" - - - - - - - - - 1

A. BEVERLEY BAXTER, ESQ., M.P.
"The World Today and Tomorrow." - - . 20

ANDREW N. McLELLAN
"Television—Progress and Promise" - - - 32

DOUGLAS JERROLD, ESQ.
"The Present Condition of England" - - - 46

H. W. TATE, M.B.E., B.A.Sc.
"Rapid Transit for Toronto" - - - - - 56

JOHN G. DIEFENBAKER, K.C., M.P.
"The Role of the Opposition in Parliament" - - 67

H. H. HANNAM, C.B.E., B.S.A.
"The Farmer Takes a Hand in World Affairs" 75

ROBERT W. KEYSERLINGK
"Between The Iron and The Ice Curtain" - - 84

REVEREND C. W. SOWBY, M.A.
"An Experiment in Education" - - - - 95

General H. D. G. Crerar, C.H., C.B., D.S.O., A.D.C.
"Some Reminiscences of 1935-45" - - - 106

Ronald A. McEachern, B.A., Ph.D.
"A Mid-Century Look Forward and Backward" 116

Dr. Oliver B. Hopkins, B.A., Ph.D.
"Western Oil Flows Eastward" - - - - 130

Ettore Mazzoleni, B.A., Mus.D.
"Music and Musicians" - - - - - - - 142

Eric Christmas
"Some Experiences in Showmanship" - - - 151

Blair Fraser
"Various Aspects of The Ottawa Scene" - - 160

Honourable Stuart S. Garson, K.C.
"The Empire, Canada and the Provinces, 1949" 170

Dr. Joseph Arlington Retty
"Iron Ore Deposits of Labrador and New Quebec" - - - - - - - - - - 183

Honourable M. J. Coldwell, M.P.
"Our Economic Relations with The United Kingdom" - - - - - - - - - 187

Willson Woodside, B.Sc.
"Stalin's Biggest Headache" - - - - - 198

Major-General D. C. Spry, C.B.E., D.S.O.
"Scouts Today—Men Tomorrow" - - - - 211

Marcus Long, M.A., Ph.D.
"Europe is Dying" - - - - - - - - 221

Warren Baldwin
"The British Election" - - - - - - 237

C. Gordon Cockshutt, M.C.
"Business Action" - - - - - - - - 248

M. GRATTAN O'LEARY
"Democracy Begins at Home" - - - - - - 258

ERIC HARDY
"The Metropolitan Problem" - - - - - - 266

OMOND MCKILLOP SOLANDT, O.B.E., M.A., D.Sc., M.D., M.R.C.P., F.R.S.C.
"Exercise Sweetbriar" - - - - - - - 276

MAJOR GLADSTONE MURRAY, M.C., D.F.C., CROIX DE GUERRE
"The Plague of Pessimism" - - - - - - 294

GREGORY CLARK
"Sportsmen, Indeed?" - - - - - - - - 304

HONOURABLE WILLIAM GRIESINGER, M.C., V.D.
"Department of Planning and Development Functions and Objectives" - - - - - - - 314

"The Annual Meeting" - - - - - - - - 324

HON. GEORGE A. DREW, K.C., LL.D., M.P.
"Freedom's Crowning Hour" - - - - - - 327

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT - - - 336

PAST HONOURARY PRESIDENTS - - - - - - 339

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1950-1951 341

CONSTITUTION - - - - - - - - - - 342

MEMBERSHIP - - - - - - - - - - 348

The opinions and views expressed in the Addresses, contained in this volume, are those of the speakers themselves and do not necessarily carry the full or partial endorsement of The Empire Club of Canada.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

"TESTING TIME"

An Address By

GEORGE McCULLAGH

At a Joint Meeting of The Empire Club of Canada and The Canadian Club of Toronto

Chairman: The President of the Canadian Club of Toronto

Friday, May 20th, 1949

Mr. McCullagh:

Your Chairman has already told of the countries I have visited since I left home a little over seven weeks ago. It does seem incredible that one could visit so many places in such a short space of time. The airplane made this one thing certain: what happens in one part of the world can no longer be a matter of indifference to people separated by oceans. All peoples are close neighbours now; all the problems which affect humanity have lost their boundaries of time and space.

As many of you are aware, I recorded the impressions of my trip in a series of articles which I wrote for those two old family journals—The Globe and Mail and The Telegram. Those who were good enough to be my readers will be somewhat penalized now, because some of the things I want to speak to you about have been referred to in the articles I have written. I want to cast my memory back and share with you now the highlights of a most interesting and challenging trip.

I left home to see once again the British Isles, which I know well and love so much, and also for the purpose of getting a first-hand view of Europe rising from the war. I had heard many and varied opinions about Britain, and they were coloured with the usual taint of pessimism that has been a companion of that nation's progress for centuries: England, they said, was through, washed up;

the war had taken not only her material and human wealth, but had impaired the spirit of her people.

I can faithfully report to you, now I have seen England, although rather briefly. I did work industriously, got about the countryside, saw leaders in public life and talked with a lot of plain, ordinary Englishmen, and as I proceed to tell you about my impressions of England and of Europe I want you to judge for yourselves whether England is through. With my own personal impressions are woven the opinions I gathered from many people, and I pass them on to you as an honest and considered digest.

I will answer one or two questions that may be paramount in your minds. I have come back with definite conviction that war is far less a possibility today than ever since the cessation of hostilities. The Russian is more hated than feared, and Britain's and America's and Canada's moral prestige was never higher. The war threat has eased off decidedly.

The easing of the tension of war in Western Europe is due to two things. It is due to the faith the countries of Western Europe have in the fact that Britain and America and Canada mean business, as evidenced by the Atlantic Pact. This creates an entirely different atmosphere as compared with the pre-1939 days. In addition, too, the remarkable improvement in the economic situation throughout Europe has had a most comforting effect on retarding the spread of Communism within the countries outside the Iron Curtain. I found this in every country—France, Italy, and markedly so in Holland. The Dutch people are repairing their damaged economy with an industry and spirit that are so characteristic of that highly civilized country. Holland was left bruised and bleeding. There is no doubt she is coming back fast and, due to the thrift of her people, she will be, relatively, one of the most prosperous countries in Europe.

This recovery has been brought about in the main by the industry, faith and application to hard work of people who had to work to live, aided and encouraged by the munificent Marshall Aid, which surely will be recorded as one of the noblest gestures of any community of citizens extended to those less fortunate.

I would like to emphasize, however, that at some point in Europe's recovery, when the physical and psychological situation is favourable, Marshall Aid will cease to be an asset. In fact, it could well become an impediment to further recovery. In its noblest conception, it was only intended as a crutch by whose assistance Europe could be helped back to economic health. Like any other crutch, if it is used after the patient has reached a certain stage of recovery, it can retard that very recuperation which we try to achieve.

You will agree, therefore, that it will become the duties of the authorities and administrators of this wonderful stimulant to decide when it should be tapered off in the best interests of the beneficiaries themselves. This will not only be a relief to the heavily burdened and generous American taxpayer, but it will also enable the patients of Europe to develop strong and healthy economic muscles of their own.

The second thing of greatest interest to this audience is that never in my life was I more proud of being a Canadian. The tremendous good-will that has accrued to the name of Canada, as a result of the sacrifices of the bravest and best of a generation of young manhood in two terrible wars, is an asset which cannot be appraised in dollars. True, it has its economic value. The name of Canada is like a magic word to the people of Europe. I found myself proudly protesting that I was a Canadian, and the reaction on the faces of those people was lovely to behold and would have nourished the ego of every one of you if you could have but witnessed it. I can only hope that we, the inheritors of this achievement, prove worthy of our bountiful legacy.

This is a testing time for all the world. In that great laboratory, out of which is either going to be produced a formula for peace or the millenium, this young and so very fortunate nation has a proud and noble part to play.

Therefore, today please bear with me, because I would like to challenge in you the spirit of public service so that we here in this very favoured land can occupy the role to which destiny is beckoning us. I will not shrink from criticism, but I mean to criticize constructively.

As one of you who has really seen the terrible aftermath of war firsthand and one who realizes, as never before, that the role we have to play is challenging and even exciting, the reward will be far greater than any of us can conceive.

Another impression I carried away from Europe—an impression firmly imbedded in my mind—is that Socialism is not the most desirable system under which to live. It is a well-known fact in my country that I have long believed that a progressive, enlightened system, guided by capitalist economy, more nearly approaches the inherent rights of human beings. Therefore, I make no apology for any observations I present to this audience which are vigorously critical of the Socialist doctrine. A system which gives free play to individual initiative and thereby nourishes that quality in every one of us—the desire to get ahead—is far more compatible with human nature than a regimented society. A patient and just study of England today has re-affirmed this—my belief.

The age-old adage "To the victor belong the spoils" is no longer applicable. Of all the countries I visited, excepting Germany, England is going through the toughest days. In far more grave days during the war—possibly because of the emotional stimulus that comes to one's rescue in those times—the Englishman was more cheery and carefree, and even optimistic.

When I first arrived in England I observed a slight trace of defeatist expression—just a mild evidence of hopelessness. However, when I left that old Island I had a feeling that any defeatism which I may have observed was slight indeed. Undoubtedly this state of the ordinary Englishman has been brought about by the combination of tragic circumstances of the last fifteen years: the insecure days preceding 1939, the beating he took for six long years during the war, and the deadening hand of a Socialist state during the last three years.

It would be unjust to attribute it all to any one of these factors alone, but it does seem tragic that a nation of gallant people, by whose efforts the stamping heel of the tyrant was turned away from all our throats, must now spend long and weary days in the tight grip of bureacratic regimentation.

The enterprising ability and the uncanny genius for improvisation and adjustment in difficult circumstances have stood this breed in good stead through centuries of wars and peace. There isn't the least doubt in my mind that the Britisher has been irked beyond description by the irritation and deadening influence of state regimentation and the countless bureaucratic Peeping Toms preventing the ordinary person from pursuing the even exercise of his own will.

But what is most striking to one coming from the New World is the apparent absence of rancor, backbiting and mud-slinging, although the political passions at times run very, very high. Perhaps it is this which the visitor from the New World mistakes for a possible lack of stamina or inability to rebel. Perhaps the vigorous, well-fed and boisterous man of the New World is a little too sure of himself to understand the strength of that which the Englishman possesses and for which there may be no special phrase except "being English," and having a thousand and more years of history behind him, standing pat, taking the blows as they come, and working hard while waiting until the whole thing blows over.

There is little doubt that economically England is very weakened and psychologically stunned but, believe me, don't sell this nation short. There is no substitute for character and brains and those of that Island have these two ingredients in astounding quantities. The breed that produced a Shakespeare, a Wellington, a Drake and a Mr. Churchill still has much to give to civilization.

What lesson has English Socialism for us who live so carefree in the lush fields of Canada? No one is certain when the British election may come; opinions vary—from this autumn to next spring.

While in England I read the latest manifesto of the Socialist party. This is likely to be the catalogue of promises on which the election will be fought if the Socialists have their way. It is an extension of the new way of life for the inhabitants of that Island. It is the most incredible insult to free spirits. It is a further extension of the Socialist doctrine. Housewives are virtually told they have not the talent to buy their own foodstuffs, that they must be advised by a government employee. Of necessity there will be more and more regulation and regimentation of everyone's life.

It is a startling reminder that once you start down the slippery slope of state coddling, the expression of human dignity inherent in our nature must be sacrificed. If you abdicate your right to think and act for yourself to some member or official of the government, you surely help to produce a castrated society.

There is one thing that stands in bold relief as a result of the latest Cripps Budget. The demagogic claim of "soak the rich" has now revealed itself in its true colours—it is phony and shockingly disingenuous. The Labour Government's latest Budget is living proof that the large body of taxpayers—the wage earners—will have to bear the load. First, the votes are garnered in the wake of preachment of class hatred; then they are called upon to pay heavily for an inefficient system of inequalities and questionable emoluments.

Security can be achieved only by the assiduous application of the principles of human dignity, hard work and thrift, and consequent success. There is no substitute for this type of security. Man's best hobby is his work. Ridiculously short hours cut a serious slice out of the economic fabric of the nation and reduce its wealth and the products of natural resources automatically as if an epidemic or plague had come and devastated them. There is no difference.

Those of us who live in this rich and privileged country should see in all this a great lesson. Every time you hear a member of a political party, and it doesn't matter which party, preaching class hatred under the guise of "soak the rich," go wary on him. It is a phony appeal to avarice and envy. It doesn't pay off.

There might be some excuse for England drifting into Socialism after she had spent her material and human wealth so lavishly for the defense of all our freedom. But if political leaders espouse this social doctrine of security to a young and rich country like ours, it is nothing short of wicked.

Security?—Yes, for the aged and ailing, but as a philosophy of life, surely not! The way to combat Socialism and Communism is to amend capitalism and make it work.

To sacrifice freedom and dignity for so-called security is contrary to the best there is in human nature. It is the way of the improvident. No decent human being wants to see luxury and privilege existing alongside poverty and want, but certainly no group of individuals constituting a nation, no matter how small or how large, can succeed with a philosophy of penalizing the industrious and subsidizing the lazy.

It is out of this type of environment that the desire for a change in system is born. I am quite sympathetic with a man like Ernest Bevin and others who have worked and toiled with their hands and have seen poverty in their own homes as I have known poverty in my own childhood. They feel for the underdog, and the tugging at their hearts leads them to political extremes. All this is understandable. But for the professional intellectuals, who find in Socialism a convenient outlet for their hostility against the so-called privileged classes from which they sprang, I have no regard.

The labouring man who joins the radical party, whether it be called Socialist or some other name, usually does so with a good heart and sincere and noble aspirations. The other, the more schooled and dangerous individual, has fastened himself to Socialism as a result of a guilty conscience arising out of his own privileged life. In this, his inner atmosphere, he addresses himself to the task, not with a heart burning with the desire for the release of his fellow-man from economic bondage, but rather with the prejudice driving him to get even with those who are loosely termed the privileged or the rich at the expense of the whole nation.

There should be no room in society for severe extremes in either political camp. Perhaps it is fairer to say that the progress of civilization to date has been achieved by the radical's efforts while he was in opposition in parliament. He has provided a bur in the tail of the complacent office holder. As evidence of this, most of the social reforms that originated in Westminster and were passed on to the New World have been legislated by Conservative governments. It is equally fair to say that they have been agitated for by Labour and Socialists. Perhaps, therefore, it is more accurate to state that the radical opposition is a very necessary and useful instrument in our democratic form of government. While they shout for Utopia, they shake the complacency of reactionary laissez-faire, and thus push society on the path of progress.

Perhaps the very qualities of good heart that spur the radical on to help his fellow-men are not usually combined with the administrative talents necessary to run a government. It might be equally true that the good qualities of heart are lost in many Conservative who are too obsessed with being efficient administrators. Perhaps, then, between the two, society is best governed by the more conventional party while the radical opposition spurs them on.

I must not dwell any further on England at the moment. I would like to portray for you a view of Italy, which to me presents the most encouraging picture of all Europe. We have long heard the expression—"Sunny Italy." I found this term most certainly appropriate for the climate and the people as well. It seems a tragedy that these peace-loving, friendly folk should have been led down the path by Mussolini. I would hazard a guess that, if the wishes of the Italian people can be made articulate through their leaders in the future, they will never again be willing to become engaged in war. The phrase current among the Italians is—"We have just won the most disastrous defeat in our history," and this witticism seems to reflect the true story.

I arrived in Italy from England to enter an almost different world. London seems drab, economically, as compared with the vivid, simple gaiety of Rome. I don't mean the frivolous variety of "night club" gaiety, but the one that is shown by the people in the streets, in the shops, in the restaurant lobbies and the railroad stations. As always, there is a lot of poverty in Italy. The largest export commodity of Italy has always been manpower. There the Marshall Plan has played a most magnificent part. In addition, Italy is not saddled with the tremendous load of taxes for armaments to defend the democracies of the world. The job of avoiding a new and disastrous war has been assumed by other nations. And so the Italian's defeat in war rather helped his unique plight from this point of view and improved his sense of gentle ease. Make no mistake, Italy is no paradise, but when you consider that a little over three years ago, she was one of the Axis powers and a battleground for the Hun invader who was being driven out by the Allied Armies, her present-day prosperity is nothing short of miraculous.

On the way to Italy, I stopped off for a hurried visit to Germany. In Munich I saw a tiny bit of Germany living in peace, but apparently not quite at peace with itself or the rest of the world. How different the Hun is from the Italian! The German seems bright, reasonably pleasant and even cheerful, but he is very bitter and I am afraid he is not particularly against Hitler yet. This is a view I found shared by every one with whom I talked about present-day Germany. It is a sad commentary, but I must faithfully report it.

There is something terrifyingly arrogant about this German in defeat. I talked with many of them. There was a young German doing police duty in Munich. In conversation I learned he was from East Prussia. I remarked on the shabbiness of his uniform, but told him how pleased I was to see the Swastika removed from the buckle of his belt. I said, 'That shows that you have no reverence for Hitler or his ideals." He turned, and with a wry smile said, "It's still inside there," and reversed his belt buckle and, sure enough, there was the Swastika emblem.

World statecraft was never faced with a more difficult human problem than the German race. After all, it would probably be unreasonable to expect the German to be anything but abnormal and bitter. The only prosperity that the Germans have known in the last twenty-five years was due to Hitler building his war machine. Their economic plight is so terrific and their prospects so grim that they would be unnatural people if they weren't bitter. How society is going to deal with this festering ulcer will challenge the best and wisest brains in the world.

The tragic situation facing Germany seems to me to present a real opportunity for Canada. I think you will agree that, taken away from his home environment, the German is a good citizen. In fact, there are no more patriotic, industrious and law-abiding citizens than those of many communities in our own country which were settled by people of the German race years ago. I am thinking of such prosperous communities as Kitchener, Ontario. Canada, I suggest, might assist in dealing with the German problem and the plight of the German people, while furthering her own broad immigration plans, by including a substantial number of those people whose forebears have proven such industrious and loyal citizens. We wouldn't do wrong.

In contrast to the simple way the Italian answers your questions, taking you at your face value and apparently hoping you will take him at his, there is an overtone of impertinent candor about the German. I can only say that I hope, in the wisdom of world statesmen, they will be careful not to trust the German with any weapons, certainly not until very much later when he learns to walk the paths of peace and believes in the very truth of the old adage that "He who lives by the sword will die by the sword."

I must say that, from this depressing environment, it was like being bathed in a healing spirit to spend Holy Week in Rome, mingling with the crowds who walked from church to church to pay homage to the Christ who, over nineteen hundred years ago, was crucified and buried and who arose from the dead, and of whose teachings this ancient city speaks and sings in stone, in work and in music.

As we all know, world peace is not threatened at the moment from Germany. The tyrannical threat to our peaceful world is Russia, and Communism. In that fight the Roman Catholic Church is well recognized as playing a leading and commendable role. I should like to speak on this to my fellow-Canadians.

Having heard on many sides in the past few years from people who need not be termed bigoted in religion, that in our passion to defeat Communism, we are playing into the hands of the Roman Catholic Church. That's said, as you all know, I want to say that I talk to you here not as an advocate of any given faith. I want to put my views before you clearly and directly. The war brought a great upsurge in religious feelings and it is but fair to state that it would seem quite unnatural if that Church failed to combat Communism with all the means it has at its disposal. Right now, I feel it is important to make clear that the appeal of Pius XII, which resulted in the election of the De Gasperi Government, was actually the turning point in the structure of post-war Italian politics.

There is frank, direct and honest criticism of the Church and of the Pope in regard to various political matters. I understand that both in Italy and in France such criticism is not looked upon as atheistic Communism. We ourselves in North America might some time question the wisdom of supporting a religious group like the one represented by the Vatican and of strengthening its position—I mean, political position—in our world. It is good that we should question the wisdom of this attitude, or any other attitude, we are about to take. But it is also true that, if we do consider Communism the greatest evil of the present moment, we would be utterly unwise if we did not co-operate to the utmost with that group which could fight Communism with the greatest perseverance, effectively and on a spiritual, rather than a purely political, plane—and such a group is certainly the Roman Catholic Church.

I am conscious of my use of the phrase "that group," but it isn't a group in the strictest sense of the word. It is an age-long tradition. It is a true spiritual empire, and I want to tell you that ceremony, pageantry, pomp and circumstance aside, the one who is privileged to talk with the Pope for a few minutes, as I was on Holy Saturday, cannot fail to be impressed with the gentleness, wisdom and amazing command the Pope has of the situation of the world and the information at his disposal. There is a striking simplicity about him and a kindness which is just plain kindness. It is amazing how, at the age of seventy-three, this lean, tall, simple person with a keen, gentle eye, quietly and seemingly without effort, will speak half a dozen languages in less than half an hour. It is obvious he does not get his information secondhand.

We ought to face squarely this immense authority and prestige of the Pope and we ought to understand the strength which the Church presents, but we ought not, of course, make the mistake of believing that the hierarchy, as a political institution, is different from other hierarchies. It is not; it cannot be. It was not and never will be. All hierarchies are instruments by means of which power is obtained and power is given and power is sought and power is fought for. This is true of labour organizations, industrial organizations, capitalist cartels or any other combines. It is even true, in a certain way, of organized sport. You always strive to win, but in sports you are aways ready to lose with a smile and try again. In power politics you never want to lose and never want to give up any power, even temporarily. This, I think, is human and I don't think that today we must look upon the Church only as a hierarchy. As a hierarchy we must watch it and deal with it in the tradition of political fair-play.

I am not coming from Rome to say that we delegate the fight against Communism only to the Church. As one born a Protestant and who intends to die a Protestant, I must say it is our job as much as that of the Church. But in order to do this job, we must not overlook that this war has made us lose a great, great number of things of spiritual value and that whatever quarrel we might have from time to time with the secular politics of the Church, its spiritual tradition and tradition of scholarship should never be overlooked. They have been overlooked many times before and I think it was wrong. Again I must say that it is incumbent upon us Protestants not to overlook the spiritual tradition of the Church, which the Protestants never discarded when they disowned the authority of the Pope.

I should have liked to stay in Rome longer, forgotten political and economic questions entirely, and to have walked around and studied the heritage of human thought and knowledge, of which Rome is the repository. As I was shown the art and treasures of the Vatican, the libraries and the museums, and as I talked with a number of Catholic scholars who have no political and no economic axes to grind, I came away with a feeling that, in this world of ours, where so much was lost through this last war and yet so little gained, we must admire those who, for almost two thousand years, lived in personal simplicity and poverty and who studied incessantly to carry on and to transmit to the generations to come the torch of human enlightenment and reason.

Time will not permit me to deal much more with Italy, but I should like to say to you a word or two of the beautiful old City of Florence. Here there is heartrending evidence of the destruction wrought by the Hun. When he was retreating before the advancing armies of the Allies in the last stages of the war, he mined and blew up three of the old picturesque bridges crossing the Arno and many of the buildings close by. But notwithstanding the pathetic scars of war, Florence presents a picture of beauty that would be hard to describe.

Nowhere in Europe did I find evidence of such happy, carefree people—an evidence of contentment— as I did in Florence. The people there were well-clad, fastidiousy dressed, and their faces reveal a serenity and happiness that was an inspiration. I was there on Easter Sunday and Monday and the beautiful parks were thronged with family parties—young mothers and fathers with their little daughters and sons, riding on thousands of bicycles. The evidence of family life and affection was charming to behold and was everywhere.

But amidst all this apparent evidence of serenity, I saw a sight that brought back to stark reality the terrible cost of war. When one sees such apparent happiness three brief years after the most vicious conflict in the history of the world, it confirms your belief that there is an infallible law of compensation. I wonder, though, if it is entirely wise that we forget too soon the price which was paid. I don't wish to cause any one anguish by making him relive the sorrows of the past, but a sight I saw in the beautiful Chianti Hills of Italy certainly jerked me back to reality. In the vineyard country, standing solemnly and proudly, there is a cemetery where lie the bodies of many hundreds of Canadians, and row upon row of white crosses make vivid the price that had been paid. As I looked, both shocked and moved, the lines of the Canadian poet, John McCrae came to my mind: "We are the dead; short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow. . . ."

Just a word about Switzerland. We Canadians remember it chiefly as the home of the League of Nations. Here in the quiet, peaceful little city of Geneva on the shores of a charming lake, nestled in the midst of the Alps, one remembers that well-meaning, sincere and patient world statesmen labored long for world peace in the period between the wars. Man's most idealistic efforts proved frail indeed against those defects of human nature which we all have: envy, greed and malice.

When in Switzerland, though, I was forcibly struck by an example that carries a great lesson for us Canadians. Within Switzerland, there is, apparently a spirit of real national unity. When you consider that this country is composed mainly of three racial entities—German, French and Italian—in both world wars, although they were not active participants, they did not remain insensitive or indifferent. The races constituting the main population of Switzerland were on opposite sides in two conflicts, but they still remained a united country.

In this there is an immense lesson for those Canadians of faint heart who have despaired, and probably are despairing, of Canada's future because of the politically made, so-called French-Canadian problem. To bring about national unity in Canada in the truest sense should not be difficult. After all, in both wars, the two races that are represented in Canada—English and French—were at least fighting on the same side. I say to all my fellow-Canadians that, after seeing the troubles that are besetting the older world, we ought to be ashamed of ourselves if we are unable to work out a happy family relationship with those whose hearts and bloodlines spring from France.

We ought to be particularly ashamed of our inability when we turn our attention to the mother country of our Canadian civilization—France. You can't forget that France fought and fought on the outposts and was always the first to be struck by the Germans. I saw France. I looked into her face. France has been bled almost white, but she is both brave and tenacious.

Three years ago, France, they told me, was still prostrate and people were actually worried about her future. Her economy was dislodged, her life disorganized. Well, France is again breathing her own fresh air of freedom. There is a new faith in France. The Marshall Plan did the trick here as it has done in so many other places. France is able to work again, and work hard. There is more to eat, there are more and more smiles on the faces of the French, and more and more they feel again an equal partner among the free nations of the world.

France has not forgotten her wounds and bruises and while she is willing to follow her western partners in the organization of peace (and Communism here, too, is on the decline), France wants to make certain that Germany will not rise again as a conquering military power and strike into the scarred body of the French nation.

We owe France security, and a united Canada could do a great deal to bring about that security. I thought about English-Canadians and French-Canadians and a secure France as I returned to England to sail for home.

There I was invited to attend the Cup Final in the football playoffs which was held at Wembley Stadium. Never in my life have I been privileged to view a more moving and inspiring sight. Here in that beautiful coliseum, where the Olympic Games were played last summer, one hundred thousand good English countrymen foregathered. It was a sunny and bright day and the English countryside never looked more attractive. The spectators ranged from humble workmen to Foreign Minister Mr. Bevin, and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh and our future Queen, Princess Elizabeth. I might say also that the distinction of the gathering was further enhanced by the presence of Canada's own Mike Pearson. The graciousness and the gentle respect that those ordinary folk paid to the Princess and her Consort was, in itself, a most refreshing sight.

The football game was keen and I must say most artful. It was a great contest for me, a Canadian, to witness, after having seen hockey. They played vigorously but, if they collided with their opponent, which they frequently did, and knocked him to the ground, they stopped to pick him up. When I heard some of the spectators say they were quite rough, I thought they should come and see how we knock them down and drag them out in the Maple Leaf Gardens.

However, here was a sight that firmly re-established your faith in that happy breed. Before the game commenced, a cheer leader talking over a public address system, asked every one to stand with song sheets and sing that old and soulful hymn—"Abide With Me."

I am not adequate to express to you what I saw. One hundred thousand of the best people on earth standing up, with keen eye and earnest face, asking God's blessing on their lives. Here, I said, is the great secret of the strength of their race. They live by a simple faith, and they are not inhibited and afraid to express it. I took a look around, and from the old ushers to the water boys to the policemen, right up to ministers of His Majesty's government and the Princess and the Duke, people stood with heads bared, telling in song their faith in God.

It was one of the most moving sights it will ever be my privilege to witness and I have no hesitancy in saying to you that, even though it may sound emotional, it strengthened my faith in the Mother Country from which we Canadians have inherited so much.

At half-time, for the entertainment of the fans, the two-month-old recruits of the Royal Air Force, with an average age of eighteen, performed gymnastics and exercises that would have done your heart good to witness. Here clad in shorts and running shoes, in the colors of that gallant service, the R.A.F., one saw the finest display of mental and physical discipline that one could imagine. With the nimbleness of ballet dancers and the strength and precision of a well-drilled and well-rehearsed team, one saw the successors to that great and noble band of gallant knights about which Mr. Churchill so beautifully, and accurately, said—"Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few." They went through their drill to the constant rounds of applause from the assembled audience. As I watched them I thought, if war were inevitable, it would be a good thing for Joe Stalin to take a look at this sight, because as surely as night follows day, if he ever does start a scrap, that same breed of young men will kick the tar out of him.

I am afraid I have rambled along disjointedly, but before closing I would like to summarize. What does all this mean to us here in Canada?

The Old World is so close to the cockpit of war that she is apprehensive. True, as I have indicated, recovery is slowly taking place. I have told you of the high esteem in which the name of this Canada of ours is held. To be the beneficiary of that good-will bespeaks a stirring challenge. To be worthy of it should be a noble aim.

Canada, in my opinion, never had a greater opportunity to advance resolutely and steadfastly to fulfill her rendezvous with destiny. In retrospect, our achievement from infancy to nationhood in less than one hundred years has been commendable, but we can be frank among ourselves.

Without being critical of any political party, I do not believe we have made the best of our opportunity, and I think you will share my view that we have never played our full role in world affairs. When wars came we paid the sacrifice, and paid it with great spirit, but in the testing time between wars, to say the least, we have been indifferent. Perhaps no more so than the rest of the peace-loving, democratic world, but these are critical days and, in very truth, the testing time. Believe me, gentlemen, in the past, Canada, with all her richness, could probably afford to lie at anchor in the stream of time. That day has gone. No longer can we let our hopes be borne at random by the flood. With our great and richly endowed land, we are so relatively fortunate that I think it presents a unique opportunity in the history of the world. If we all play our small parts in first making the affairs of our nation work better and with less class distinction, I make the boast that Canada could probably produce a formula which would become contagious and set a pattern for world conduct.

I implore every one within the reach of my voice to realize that this can only be done by taking an intelligent interest in the affairs of your country. This is an old theme with me, but everything I have seen which emphasizes the tragedy and waste of war has re-established my faith that there is no short route to adult nationhood.

In the older countries men do not shrink from advocating vigorously opposing political views. The business men and the ordinary men and women in the United Kingdom take an active interest in the affairs of their country. It is adolescent that we should do otherwise. I assure you it is my opinion that if we, with our relatively small population and our comparably simple problems, can't develop a united nation free from class prejudices, there is certainly no hope for the rest of the world. These aren't high-sounding words. They can be achievements.

I say to all you industrialists and men who employ labor, please take an active interest. Identify yourself with the political organization of your choice and contribute to public discussion and, in this way, let us refine the truth. It is not easy—they will call you a lot of funny names. It is in the distillation and free flow of ideas that free society can best flourish. Your employees, the laboring man and the small householder will respect you more and, in mutual respect, lies our great future.

In being critical, I am familiar with the popular excuse in Canada that it is not dignified to take an interest in politics. Surely it is a terrible admission of bankruptcy.

May I tell you of a statement I heard which hit me between the eyes and which, I think, will impress you. At dinner on the Queen Mary, with Mr. Winston Churchill and a small party, during gay political discussion, some of the guests were vigorously protesting their political views. Mr. Churchill's son, Randolph, said—"Now, father, don't forget to stand on your dignity." The seventy-four-year-old warrior levelled a searching eye at him and said—"My boy, I have never known anyone's dignity to become higher by standing on it." May I repeat that—I have never known anyone's dignity to become higher by standing on it. It is a statement pregnant with thought for every one of us Canadians.

In closing, may I say that fighting in wars is only a form of public service. Those engaged in this form of public service express a willingness to die for their country if necessary. Surely, it is equally noble to live for one's country—perhaps just as difficult, and most certainly a more abiding and a more rewarding task.

"THE WORLD TODAY AND TOMORROW"

AN ADDRESS BY

A. BEVERLEY BAXTER, ESQ., M.P.

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Monday, September 12th, 1949

MR. COLEBROOK:

In August 1939 when the whole world was wondering if and when war was coming, our honoured guest spoke to a very large combined meeting of the Canadian and Empire Clubs.

Again in 1941, in those very dark and dreadful days of uncertainty, our honoured guest addressed a joint meeting of the two Clubs and left with us a message of encouragement and hope.

Today, after the war has been won—but certainly not the peace—we are delighted to again have our fellow Canadian back with us and we look forward to his address with keen pleasure.

Most of our members are familiar with Mr. Baxter's colourful background, so I shall only briefly touch on the highlights:—

From piano salesman in Toronto to service in the First World War; to Editorial writer on the London Daily Express; later as Managing Editor of the Sunday Express; In 1935 we find him sucessfully contesting the Wood Green (London) constituency as a Conservative member, which Constituency re-elected him in the last British General Election—one of the very few to carry the Winston Churchill banner to victory.

About that time he commenced his semi-monthly London Letter in McLean's magazine which is perhaps one of the most widely read editorials in Canada, more popular than ever today.

In 1938 Mr. Baxter again entered British journalism, being appointed Editorial Advisor to Lord Kemsley's huge chain of Allied Publications—a position he held until 1942.

During the Battle of Britain Mr. Baxter teamed up with Lord Beaverbrook as a production expediter in the Aircraft Industry.

Since that time our guest has written—and is still writing—numerous articles under various nom de plumes, appearing in Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa as well as acting as dramatic critic for the London Evening Standard.

Our honoured guest has chosen as his title for today:

"THE WORLD TODAY AND TOMORROW"

Mr. Baxter:

Mr. President, Gentlemen and Fellow Torontonians: I am greatly honoured that after this lapse of time so many of you are still willing to listen to me speak. I think as long as I ration my appearances, and don't come back to live here, you will still listen to me. But may I say that one can never lose the long associations of one's boyhood. It was here, muling and puking in my mother's arms, after Dr. Clouse had done his part, that I looked out upon life, and I suppose what you are when you are a boy and what your parents and heredity make of you, so you persist until the end of your days.

Therefore, I am deeply honoured at this reception in my own home town.

But now may I say that, having come back to my own home town, I think you will have to look to yourselves that you are not too modest in comparison to some of the other cities that I visited on this trip. I was in Edmonton the other day, and at various times during my visit I was informed that Edmonton was the gateway to the North, the Crossroads of the World and the world's oil capital.

At Montreal they told me Montreal was the only metropolis on the American Continent.

Vancouver, with its delightful and friendly sense of under-statement, just said their city was not more than the Paradise of the Pacific.

I therefore think you must look to it, because you and I know that there is only one place where anybody would live if they could choose, and that would be Toronto. I heard some disbelievers across Canada, so if your Publicity Relations officer is here, I suggest that he might find some slogan to equal your modest East—West neighbors.

Gentlemen, today I have chosen to appear before you as something between a prophet and a guesser. Perhaps the fact that there is to be a world tomorrow might be soothing to the nerves, because after reading some of the American columnists, I feel very much like a friend of mine from London who had been reading messages from America. I called him up and asked him to lunch. "No," he said, "I have been reading the papers, and if you don't mind, I will stay in bed and wait peacefully for the end." It is true, that people are always announcing the coming end of the world, especially megalomaniacs. Tiberius in ancient Rome said "the world will go down in flames when I die." Louis XV, said "Aprés moi le deluge". Hitler thought he would bring the world down in ruins, and perhaps he did the best job of the lot. But the world will go on.

First, I want to deal with what is going to happen in that lovable island and nation of destiny, Great Britain. At the present time Britain is under much criticism, some of it deserved, some of it undeserved. There are those who dislike Britain's present government so much that they expand their dislike to the country itself. Well I want to say now that not everything that the Socialist Government has done is bad; in fact, in the course of what I have to say I am going to pay tribute to the Socialists, if I can think of anything.

But nevertheless, gentlemen, what is happening in Britain—what is really going on there is another English revolution. Every 75 or 100 years the British try a revolution, and they are nearly always bloodless. They did of course cut off the head of Charles I, but they were so sorry about that, that even today, at the anniversary of his death, loyal and faithful people go and lay wreaths on the statue of "Charles the Martyr". The British prefer revolutions without bloodshed. When King John did not give them their liberties, they turned to the barons for the Magna Carta, just as eventually I think the people will turn to the Conservatives to give them back the liberties that the Socialists have taken from them.

After the war the Conservatives had been in power for 25 years, with two 20-minute intervals of Socialist government—we were therefore in power between the two wars, and the people wanted a change. It is a very good thing indeed for any party that has been in power for a long time to go into the discard, and have a housecleaning. No party should remain in power too long in any country, except Canada. So they thought they would try a change in England, and believe me, Gentlemen, they are not unimportant, the things that have happened. If the Conservatives assume office next May, we would be utter fools to imagine for a moment that we could go back to things exactly as they were before. Under the double stress of Socialist government and the enforced austerity of life in England, many things have been changed and permanently changed. There is a greater equality in England today than in any other democratic country. When I tell you that on Saturday afternoons the dukes charge half a crown for admission to their estates in order to try to pay their way, and one duke calls up another duke and says, "By Gad, I'm 7/6 up on Saturday!" You will see that things are happening over there.

Well some of it, I repeat, is good. There is very little ostentation. That is a good thing to get rid of. With it, however, goes elegance of life as well, which is a pity. But because we are so hard pressed and because life is austere, human nature reaches out for other things, things which can not be represented in terms of money, and thus we are having a very considerable renaissance of the arts. The theatre today in London has probably the best acting of its entire and glorious career, and the public is adventurous for plays of ideas. The same applies to the other forms of art.

And also there is a realization that we must move more and more in England toward prospering of the English invention of the Middle Class in which the aristocrat may remain as one of the colorful things of life but in which the underprivileged must have a fairer share.

Now those things are good.

Then what is bad? I am sorry to say that we are seeing the creation of that Mid-European conception of the State. It is like a crow that rests upon your shoulder from morning until night. The State is becoming the one importer. The State has to do with every habit—the electric light, the gas, the transport, the postman, the telephone—now into the steel industry—the coal mine. It is beginning to permeate everything we do—from morning to night, this rising monster of the State. It is alright as long as it is directed perhaps by men who are, some of them, mild, some of them sensible, nearly all of them loyal; but they are fashioning an instrument which history shows will be grasped some day by stronger hands. That is the danger of Socialism.

One other thing it has done. The Socialists boast they have done away with the two incentives of Capitalism—that is greed and fear—greed of profits and fear of unemployment. In the Socialists' eyes profits are evil things, and to show they are sincere about that, they operate all the nationalized industries at a loss. But the Socialists admit they have not been able to find substitute incentives. We are running races with no prizes. We Conservatives did not create human nature; you would think sometimes we did to hear our Socialists friends talk. But human nature wants some prize,—it may be money, it may be fame, it may even be a bit of ribbon called the Victoria Cross which my friend Thane McDowell, here, got during the war. But human nature needs some incentive. I would hate to live in a system of society where that no longer exists.

I would like to make this prediction. I believe the Conservative Party will be returned to power at the next election. Of course elections are unpredictable, even in Canada. But I will not say any more about that—I promised my grandmother I would behave myself while on this trip.

Therefore I predict that in England, which as always is the laboratory of civilization, we are probably working out in the usual haphazard British way a plan of humanist capitalism where the government of the day must have much greater power than in any former era; where capital and management must recognize responsibility to the nation and the community; where labor must have an increasing place as a partner; but where under it all, there must be unfettered leadership, individual leadership providing that that leadership accepts its communal responsibility. It sounds a little involved, but I believe something like that will come out of it, and out of the present great experiment in England we may find a model which will be useful to you, and useful to other democratic countries.

Now may I leave Britain resting in its Socialist twilight for a moment and turn to America? What is going on at Washington just now is very important, but I don't believe it is as important as some of them think over there. America finds herself today, gentlemen, in practically the exact position as Britain did in the nineteenth century. Now in that hundred years,—actually ninety-nine—from the Battle of Waterloo to the declaration of war in 1914, during what is called the *Pax Britannica,* under the world control of the Bank of England, the currencies of the world were kept interchangeable. Britain, as the creditor power said, "As we are the supreme creditor, we must open our markets to every exporter in the world: there must be no barriers: a creditor country can not have barriers to trade." Not until the Ottawa agreements in 1932 did Britain first give a preference to a Dominion. British funds, British wealth poured out in an endless flood of investment. If somebody wanted to pay back, so much the better. But nobody cared very much. Britain had the conception that all that mattered was trade, trade, and they gambled on their trade, on their services of shipping and insurance. They knew they could only do well out of it if the others did as well.

After the Civil War Britain poured millions upon millions into the United States. The United States was stricken, impoverished, tired after her long war. And Britain poured money into the United States. I say this with some diffidence, because I have not seen the point raised before, and therefore I merely say it to you, gentlemen, as nothing more than dropping a pebble in the pool —when the war began the American Government had a perfect right to assume that this was a European war if they chose to take that attitude, and when France fell after a short period of fighting, the President said to us, in effect: "Well France has fallen, therefore her American investments must be frozen because since she has surrendered, they must be kept for her until after the war is over; but as you are going to fight on, we must take your American securities in payment of par armaments, and when you can not pay any more we will bring in Leaseland, which Churchill has rightly described as one of the "most unsordid acts of history."

But in 1941 Germany and Japan both declared war against the United States, though they had Russia against them, showing that it was their intention not only to defeat us in Europe but to drive the United States into impotent isolation. Therefore the United States must see that it was a war against them as much as it was against us. Since this they have helped us with an unstinted generosity, yet I wonder if, instead of giving us money and credit, could they not have restored those securities of ours, those investments of ours in the United States. It would not cost them any more, it would save them the embarrassment of too many imports from Britain. And if they could sell those investments during the war to their people, they could now buy them back. I think it would be a great gesture.

However, we find ourselves with a country, a creditor country that either can not or will not import. I don't know what the answer is. Certainly not the American loan. Ninety of us voted against that in the House of Commons because we did not believe it was a settlement. Even with the Marshall Plan I led a rebellion in the House of ten Tories, although we were joined by the two Communist members. The trouble with a rebellion is you never know who is going to join you.

I don't know what is going to be the answer; but it will not be found in loans or Marshall aid. Then what is the answer?

In England when a man speaks flippantly we listen to him. The English are a funny crowd. When they reveal their innermost thoughts they are apt to do it in a lighthearted way. I want to tell you of one night when Sir Samuel Hoare was talking to three or four of us. He has since gone to the House of Lords, that distant land from whose bourne no traveller returns. Sam Hoare was saying, "We are seeing the beginning of the Third British Empire." And we said to him, "What is that?"

"Oh," he said, "the First British Empire began with the loss of the American Colonies. The Second British Empire began with the inclusion of India and is ending roughly with India going out, at any rate as we knew it."

We said, "What is the Third British Empire going to be?" He said, "The Third Empire will see the return of the American Colonies."

We laughed. Then we stopped laughing, and thought.

The next day the American Ambassador, Lew Douglas, who is a grand chap and one of the best ambassadors the Americans have had, called me up and said, "I hear you are going to lecture in the United States. What are you going to talk to my people about?" I said, I was going to lecture on the Third British Empire, and I told him what Sam Hoare had said. He laughed and said, "I am not so sure there isn't something in the idea:

but are you going to use exactly the term 'American Colonies' when you are talking to my people?"

I told him: "I am going to try it first in Boston from that on I may have to vary the phrase a bit."

Oddly enough, I did so at Boston, after some tactful local utterances regarding the Boston Tea Party, of which they apparently have not heard in Boston but more or less across the United States, I used those terms and found among the thinking people quite, quite an interest and some feeling that vaguely it was going to be true.

Lord Beaverbrook, who is a great man and a wise old owl, said the night before I was coming away, "Keep this in the back of your mind: the dollar crisis will come before the sterling crisis."

So I make a prediction that somehow—how it is to be done I don't know—somehow the relentless logic of events will move the United States toward the sterling block into some kind of a working partnership. I have maintained since the end of this war that the United States should never approach us in Britain as one of the dependent occupied conquered nations. We were not conquered, we were not occupied, and America should approach us as an equal, as a partner to share with her the problems of the world, not as a dependent.

Now, gentlemen, where does Canada come into all this? If my old friend, the Toronto Star, which I respect with a veneration of almost unspeakable depth—says: "We don't want advice from you, because you are simply a renegade Canadian," may I say that three months ago when I was coming out here, I asked the Foreign Office for a renewal of my British passport, which I had had for thirty years, and the British office said, "You are not entitled now to a British passport, you must apply now to the Canadian High Commissioner for a Canadian passport." So, gentlemen, there is no use resenting what I am going to say because I will brandish my Canadian passport in your faces and claim the right to speak.

But may I say that coming back to Canada, from the moment you look from the ship and see a dim pencilled line against the horizon which was once Newfoundland and which is now Canada, when you travel across this country with its vibrance, its unused strength, its sense of growing before your eyes,—I have never felt that so strongly as on this trip—I have never felt so strongly that Canada is something more than just the favoured younger brother of America and the much loved oldest son of the Empire. You are a great World Power. Whether you like it or not, your country can no more deny its coming of age than my own son in England who had to pay the penalty of being eighteen by being called up for military service, to which I agree entirely.

But a country comes of age. I sometimes think Canada is going to determine this dollar-sterling block. I believe Canada alone can influence both sides. You are an equal now. I sometimes think that in the development of the sterling block, we need you more, we need your industrial genius, your organizers. Britain is tired, Britain will live again but she is tired. We need the strength of the rest of the family.

I have found on this trip much criticism of British methods of selling, I have found some impatience of what is going on in Britain, to which I make no criticism, but I wonder, gentlemen, how many people in Canada recognize this. I saw these figures published, and therefore I assume that they are true—that 1,250,000 Canadian workers depend for their work upon their exports to the sterling area; 250,000 depend on their exports to America. If we go 'bust', if we are forced—which is not impossible—if we are forced over there to lower our standard of living to the very lowest possible degree and to create in the sterling block a closed economy, which is possible, and live as if the dollar does not exist, which we may have to do—then one worker out of four is out of work in Canada.

Now it is more important, gentlemen, to think of that than to be angry with British methods of salesmanship, which badly need improvement I know: better than claiming prices are too high, for remember your prices to us are high too.

I can't help but think—and again this time I drop a bigger pebble in the pool—I can not help thinking that somehow Canada may by a dual currency, or some such system, come also into the sterling block. If she does, think what the sterling block is, the teeming markets of Britain, New Zealand, South Africa, Pakistan, India, Egypt, Iran, Iraq,—Ireland is in on it on Saturday and out Wednesday—and all the teeming, growing colonies of Africa in one world-trading unit. And if you say "Nothing matters to us but the dollar", or if the Americans say "nothing matters but the dollar," we would reply that in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread", could almost without blasphemy be, "Give us this day our daily *work*." Work is the dignity of man, work is what raises the whole status and stature of a man. When some mistake was made and Herbert Morrison encouraged the growing of apple trees in Canada, then we could not go through with it, and Canadian farmers had to tear up and uproot thousands of apple trees, then you are striking at something which is at the very basis and elemental of human nature. When a man sows the seed, watches the tree grow, plucks the fruit, and then finds nobody wants what is grown, then you unleash upon your country and people unknown dangers.

So, gentlemen, because you are so influential, you will forgive me if I still think that the answer of the dollar is to find some way, somehow, to work it in harmony with the sterling, and not on the basis of charity. We in England have experienced such generosity at your hands, —today in England there is no country stands so high—this is true, I say it to you as a Canadian—there is no country in the world stands so high in the gratitude and estimation of the British people as this country of Canada. That is absolutely true. But charity is not the answer.

Shakespeare, who foresaw nearly every human situation caused Polonius to give a lot of advice to Laertes, and you remember, he said, "Neither a Borrower nor a Lender be, for lending loses oft both loan and credit, and borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry." We can not solve this difficulty by loans which threaten both loan and friend, we can not solve it when loans tend to dull the edge of husbandry. Therefore I end with this prophecy. I believe that The Hundred Years War, which is now seeing its climax, a hundred years since Karl Marx wrote "DAS KAPITAL" and declared war on society, is reaching its climax. That war is not going to be decided by the Atomic Bomb, nor the Red Army; it is going to be decided by whether or not Western civilization can come together in peace, or whether it must wait for another war. If it was possible in war, because of a common enemy, to unite the output of the factories of Pittsburgh and Detroit and Chicago and Winnipeg and Leeds and Birmingham and London, if it was possible to send young men out to a common death, if it was possible to pool our resources against the enemy of that time, then now, faced with the climax of the Hundred Years War against Communism, faced with the very challenge of destiny, what will history say of us if, as the result of what is going on, Western civilization crumbles because we can not get tickets printed in the right colour to permit the flow of goods from those who have to those who need it.

"TELEVISION—PROGRESS AND PROMISE"

An Address By

ANDREW N. McLELLAN,

Director of Television,
Academy of Radio Arts, Toronto

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, October 6th, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

The subject to be discussed by our Guest Speaker, namely, "Television — Progress and Promise", is one which I assume is of great interest to all.

There are those who believe that if Private Enterprise had had a free hand to develop this new Industry that we should have been much further along the road of accomplishment in Canada than we find ourselves today.

Mr. McLellan has for several years been studying this very interesting, new scientific achievement in both Canada and the United States — he has lectured at Queen's University and the University of Toronto on the subject and written many articles.

He has been referred to as "one of the few Canadian authorities on the subject of Television Broadcasting".

It gives me much pleasure to introduce Mr. Andrew McLellan.

Mr. McLellan:

Television is not only a very fascinating topic but also a very complex one, and so all I can hope to accomplish within the brief time allotted to me today is to give you the highlights of its development and potentialities.

But before we begin to get involved in an appraisal of the progress and promise of television broadcasting, we should perhaps ask ourselves one very simple but, nonetheless, very vital question. What is television?

Well, I don't suppose many of us would come up with the same answer to this question, but I'm certain we would all have something to offer for television has become a household word in Canada even in spite of apparent disinterest on the parts of its guardians. We might go so far as to say that television in Canada has actually become conspicuous by its absence. When I say "absence" I mean, of course, lack of active participation in the medium. It is true, we do have television in Canada, but strictly by remote control.

The late Roly Young, Columnist, Toronto Globe & Mail, once defined television as "something to put on a radio so that folks can see things are really as bad as they heard they were". This may (or may not) be a somewhat accurate description of most television south of the border, but let us employ a more realistic and academic approach. Literally, the word television means "seeing at a distance". Technically, television may be defined as the "instantaneous transmission of still or moving images by electronic means, containing sufficient detail for entertainment or informative purposes". Historically, television means the fulfilment of man's age-old longing to see beyond the horizon, through obstaclesm and to be in more than one place at the same instant. Sociologically, television possesses the potentiality of being the most effective means for human enlightenment, education and propaganda that human intellect has yet devised. Psychologically, the simultaneous transmission of sight impressions with associated sound impressions constitutes communication in its truest sense, for sight and sound together make up the most fundamental avenue of communication to the human mind. Therefore, since radio is "blind" it is perhaps more accurate to say that it is an incomplete form of television, rather than that television is merely an improvement on radio. That very few radio people agree with such a conclusion shouldn't be too surprising.

The basic idea behind television is certainly not new. We have mentioned man's longing to see beyond the horizon, through obstacles, and to be in more than one place at the same instant. Within the realm of fancy an unknown Persian perhaps was the first to dream of television as we know it today. In a favorite Arabian Nights story he told of a magic tube in which a love-sick Prince of India could see his beloved, however far away she might be. But since modern television is essentially an electronic process, as well as an artistic medium of expression, its development, quite logically, has followed hand-in-hand with the evolution of electricity and the science of the electron. Certain fundamental scientific discoveries had to be made before it could come within the realm of practical devices.

Many historians conclude that television got its first practical start nearly 75 years ago, in 1875, when G. R. Carey, an American, designed a television system which closely imitated the human eye. Other historians disagree, and as one who has devoted considerable energy to historical research of the medium, I can assure that few other sciences or arts have been plagued with so many inconsistences and differences of opinion, to say nothing of conflicting claims of priority. Eventually Russia will probably lay full claim to television and settle any doubts we may have.

However, I do want to make it clear that practical television is not nearly as new as most people seem to believe, nor is it an exclusive invention of the United States of America. Since the early 1800s, scientists and inventors in Europe (particularly in Great Britain) as well as in America have made countless significant and essential contributions toward its development.

Following the turn of the century a well defined pattern for future development was soon established. Early television devices, principally mechanical in nature, produced only very crude images. In 1911, an Englishman named A. A. Campbell-Swinton hit upon the essentials of modern electronic television, but only theoretically. By this time the phonograph and telephone had been invented, Marconi had sent and received the first wireless telegraphy signals, and Thomas Edison had filmed the first motion picture.

In 1926, John Logie Baird, the Scottish inventive genius and television pioneer, demonstrated the first transmission of "real" images between one point and another. According to the London Times it was the first time in history that "actual" television had been demonstrated. Said the Times—"No one but this Scottish minister's son has ever transmitted and received a recognizable image with its gradation of light and shade."

American recognition of the achievement was contained in an editorial which appeared in Radio News of that year.

> "Mr. Baird has definitely and indisputably given a demonstration of real television. It is the first time in history that this has been done in any part of the world."

The following year (1927) the American Telephone and Telegraph Company transmitted images between New York and Washington using ordinary telephone wires as the carrier. Baird accomplished a similar transmission between London and Glasgow.

In 1936 the British Broadcasting Corporation opened television studios in Alexandra Palace, London, and a regular daily service—the first in the worlt—was maintained in England until the outbreak of the war. Prior to 1939 television had also been introduced in France, Germany, Russia, Sweden and Japan.

In the United States television has been comparatively active since 1929, but it was not until 1941 when the government authorized commercial operations, that the industry got its real start. However, it was short-lived for the following year America was also in the war and was compelled to curtail further expansion. Although the war greatly retarded the commercial development of television, from the technical standpoint it advanced the medium many years. Even under the restrictions of wartime outstanding progress was achieved for greatly expanded electronic research brought forth many new developments applicable to this infant prodigy. And it should not be overlooked that television itself made a notable contribution to the winning of the war by giving incentive to such inventions as radar, the television bomb and pilotless aircraft.

Shortly after the end of the war the BBC resumed its Television Service in Britain. There were approximately 20,000 receivers in operation in the London area prior to 1946, the majority of which were pre-war models. This meant that the BBC was compelled to provide a service of pre-war standard in order that existing sets would not become immediately obsolete. But at the same time it was realized that a greatly improved post-war standard was inevitable and necessary. The change-over is not yet completed for it is being carried out very gradually so as to cause as little loss and inconvenience as possible.

The quality of British television programs has, for the most part been consistently high. Perhaps this has been partly due to the absence of commercialism. It may also be due to the fact that the BBC has been blessed with a reasonably adequate budget for its Television Service, made up from receiving set license fees and a governmental grant. However, to my mind the outstanding success of BBC television programming has been largely due to an inherent fearless enthusiasm and unfrustrated ambition. British television producers have been allowed tremendous latitude to try new program ideas and to develop new and distinctive techniques of presentation. In other words, they have succeeded in accomplishing "real" television!

Since V-J Day television has made phenomenal progress in the United States. In 1946 there were only six commercial stations in operation (three of which were in New York City) and approximately 10,000 receivers in use. Today there are more than eighty commercial stations from coast-to-coast, with over two million receivers in use. By 1953 it is anticipated that there will be at least 400 stations and 15,000,000 receivers in operation.

American television is no longer confined to New York, Chicago and Los Angeles as it was just three short years ago. Stations have been established in nearly every State of the Union, and network facilities, so essential to full commercial operations, have practically become national in scope.

It is significant to me that nearly every major advertiser in the U.S. is now using television in less or greater degree. Last year over $10,000,000 was spent by more than 700 advertisers in the medium. This year the total is expected to exceed $25,000,000, with over 1000 participating advertisers. This is indeed a sharp contrast to the mere 160 sponsors that used television during 1947. Nevertheless, television certainly has a long way to go before it equals the $447,000,000 that went in American radio advertising in 1947.

Whether or not commercialism is a good thing for television I am not prepared to discuss today. Someone must naturally pay the bills, and if it isn't the commercial sponsor then it will have to be the consumer. I doubt very much if the American public would ever take kindly to a $10 or $25 a year license fee, such as is being proposed for this country. And, furthermore, I doubt whether such a fee would even begin to provide sufficient revenue to maintain the 2000 potential American television stations.

The consumer already pays approximately half the cost of all advertising as it is, but he does so in a way which is indirect and, for the most part, painless to him. His present obligation ends when he buys his radio or television receiver, newspaper or magazine copy. Whether or not he responds to the advertiser's message is purely voluntary and it is a gamble every advertiser must of necessity accept.

It has been thoroughly established that television delivers greater sales impact than any other advertising media, since it combines sight plus sound, plus action, plus entertainment. Contrary to common belief television set ownership is predominantly in the middle or lower income groups. This makes it a mass medium and present television markets already account for over 40% of annual U.S. retail sales.

The Ford Motor Company, which is one of America's biggest advertisers, has dropped its radio appropriations this year in favor of television. Why? Because television, generally, provides the lowest cost method of actual product demonstration. For example, the average demonstration expense of an automobile in a showroom is $4.12 as compared to 1.6c for which the car can now be demonstrated over television.

Perhaps American television is not a true or even encouraging example of what the medium can and will one day be. With but few exceptions the programming has been very poor. The broadcaster claims that it has been due to lack of commercial revenue, and the public places the blame on too much commercialism. Both arguments may have equal merit, but I believe the reason is primarily due to the lack of fearless enthusiasm and unfrustrated ambition that I previously refered to as being so vital a part of British television programming.

Television is by no means limited to the spheres of entertainment and advertising. Its applications to industry, commerce, education and medicine are every bit as promising as they are prodigious.

In industry, television can perform a great many functions, such as:

> *Traffic Control*—In manufacturing processes where production line or mass assembly methods are employed, a number of remote camera units can be utilized at 'key control points' and each monitored at a central control station, from which telephone instructions and directions can be given.
>
> *Time-Study Observation*—Remote observation of individual production methods and operations can be carried out by locating camera units at prescribed points.
>
> *Remote Inspection and Control*—The use of fixed-focus cameras in laboratories and at critical points in

production lines to facilitate inspection of materials and observation of processes and gauges in locations where explosive materials or dangerous cases make it impractical for workers to perform such functions.

It is of interest to note that during the Atom Bomb test at Bikini (and elsewhere), television cameras were located on the Atol and provided a close-up observation of the *immediate* effects of the explosion, which was monitored in the control warship five miles at sea. Also, at the Wright Aeronautics Laboratories, television cameras are being used to observe the testing of new aircraft engines, where the danger of explosion and mechanical mishap is quite high.

In commerce television has also proved itself to be of promising value. Two or three banks in the United States and in Britain are currently using television for such functions as signature verification and the prompt inspection of documents which may be stored in vaults several miles from the bank head-office or branches. The latter use is of particular importance to banks in such cities as London and New York where storage space is at a premium and overhead costs are so high.

If the old adage that "seeing is believing" is as true as most of us regard it to be then in the field of education television promises to render its greatest service to mankind. I refer not only to education in the classroom, but to education in the home as well. Television will be our "showroom" to the world. It will take us on journeys to strange lands and introduce us to the peoples of the earth. It will enable us to visit the great museums and art galleries without even leaving the comfort of our homes. In the classroom television will help to extend the well established value of audio-visual teaching techniques.

In the field of medicine—surgery, physiotherapy, and phychiatry—it is already well realized what a great part television can and will play in teaching and administering these sciences. Guy's Hospital in London recently set the pace by installing the first permanent hospital television system in the world. In 1939 a medical operation was televised from a hospital in Brooklyn, New York. Since that time many such demonstrations have taken place, including one early this year before members of the Canadian Medical Association at their annual convention in Saskatoon. However, the most noteworthy demonstrations, to date, of televised surgery were those accomplished recently in full color.

By suspending a television camera (and a microphone) over the operating-table it is possible to permit any number of medical students and doctors to view an operation at close-range. They are thereby able to intimately observe every detail of the surgeon's technique and skill, and at the same time, are able to hear every syllable of his instructions and directions.

A large hospital presently under construction in Washington, D.C. has formulated very extensive plans for the use of television in the treatment and observation of mental cases, as well as surgery. Cameras will be strategically located throughout the wards for remote observation of the patient's behaviour and film recordings will be made of what the camera sees for consultation and study purposes, and for circulation to other medical institutions throughout the world.

Television has also been used with promising success in department store merchandising. Store traffic can be routed to certain counters or departments by installing receivers through which specially prepared demonstrations and "attention getting" displays are viewed by the prospective customers. The operating cost of such a system will be very reasonable and the equipment involved permits the store to originate its own commercials for broadcasting over local stations.

(Other uses of television include its utilization in traffic safety, the guarding of asylums and prison corridors, underwater exploration and as an aid to motion picture production procedure.)

Motion picture interests have been experimenting with large-screen theatre television for several years. Equipment has been perfected that will throw an image of comparable size and clarity to movie film. Recently such equipment was installed in a number of theatres in the United States, and nearly every major theatre circuit is planning to make such installations just as soon as relay transmission standards are formulated and equipment is available. In London, theatre television has been in use since as early as 1930. Here in Canada, Famous Players Canadian Corporation has been planning a theatre system for several years, and early this year announced that they would soon install such equipment in their local Imperial Theatre.

A theatre television system makes it possible to bring to patrons special events and remote programs, such as sports events, parades, fires, spot news and civic functions. If downtown Toronto theatres had been equipped with theatre television at the time of the recent Noronic steamship disaster, theatre patrons could have been provided with an on-the-spot, exciting and timely coverage of the event the same day it happened. One New York television station (WPIX) flew a newsreel cameraman to Toronto on the morning of the fire and had the films back in New York and on the air by 9 o'clock that evening. (The newsreel companies didn't have scenes of the dissaster on local screens for four or five days.)

Now a word about color television. The first hint of the possibility of being able to telecast in color was produced by John Logie Baird as long ago as 1928. Since that time a great deal of research has gone on and numerous color systems have been advanced. Today, color television is a practical reality and awaits only official authorization. The Federal Communications Commission in the United States is currently holding hearings on the prospective development and introduction of color television, and will subsequently decide upon the type of system and transmission standards to be employed. The value of color in television will be apparent to everyone.

What about television in Canada? As soon as anyone discovers that you have any connection with the medium this is the first question they ask and, unfortunately, it's a question to which anyone who is outside the so-called "inner circle" cannot give a very definite answer. As a matter of fact, I sometimes wonder whether or not anyone in this country really knows what to expect so far as television is concerned—including those who should know. Interest has been running hot and cold for several years but very little action, if any, has been taken to give television to the Canadian public, even on an experimental basis.

In 1939, Mr. Leonard W. Brockington, K.C., at that time chairman of the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation said:

> "So far as the Board of Governors of the CBC is concerned, its present policy is not to alienate from the public domain any broadcasting rights in television to privately-owned stations or other profit-making concerns! The CBC is fully alive to the desirability of providing for the Canadian public a television service as soon as the necessary expenditures come within the bounds of the practicable."

This was an official attitude or, if you prefer, condition, that was to prevail in Canada for at least another decade.

There can be little doubt that the CBC has certainly dictated the television policy in this country since 1936. Of course it was given constitutional authority to do so, and it has merely taken full advantage of such authority. It is true, of course, that the Corporation has not had sufficient finances to enter the field itself, but it has selfishly discouraged others from doing so.

> Said general manager, Dr. Augustin Frigon, in 1946: "We are firmly of the opinion that television has not yet reached the point where it is ready for use in Canada because of the financial requirements involved. Anybody could experiment with television in Canada on a laboratory scale. A lot of people could have

> been experimenting with television in studios, but nothing has been done to our knowledge in the field of such experimenting."

There is little doubt in my mind as to why nothing has been done outside the CBC. The private broadcasters were not willing to risk their monies in pioneering a field in which they could not even be assured free competition, absolute security and respect for prior rights.

It is interesting to note at this point that in 1932 (four years before the CBC came into being) there were at least seven licensed experimental television transmitters in Canada, located from British Columbia to Quebec.

Within the past two years the CBC has three times considered applications for television station licenses from a number of private concerns, and each time deferred or cancelled the applications. The board of governors indicated that it believed Canada should not lag behind in television, but that television channels should be used only in the public interest. Apparently only the CBC could operate in the public interest. Chairman of the board, A Davidson Dunton said:

> "We are not holding anybody up. There are a limited number of channels to be alloted. There are only three channels in Toronto (and) one of them is reserved for the national system".

Commenting on the CBC's decision to 'indefinitely postpone' the establishment of public or privately-owned television stations, Toronto Saturday Night perhaps expressed the feelings of many Canadians:

> "In Canada some private broadcasters are financially equipped to install television transmitters, whereas the CBC is not—the Corporation would like to run the show, as indeed it must do if television is to have any sort of cultural significance. On the other hand, the CBC cannot block the aspirations of private enterprise indefinitely without earning for itself a reputation for capriciousness and tyranny".

As the situation stands today, the CBC is soon to be granted a government loan of $4,500,000 for the purpose of establishing one station in Toronto, and one in Montreal. It is anticipated that these stations will be in operation sometime next year. In the meantime the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (popularly known as the Massey Commission) is holding hearings on the question of television in Canada, but these largely concern future policy and development and will probably not influence the situation for some time to come.

One of the main issues at stake so far as the Massey Commission is concerned is should the authority over radio and television be divorced from the CBC and be placed in the hands of an independent regulatory body. In other words, should radio and television in Canada be re-established on a free, competitive basis. Private enterprise naturally thinks they should. So does a large percentage of the Canadian public. It is impossible to even surmise what the final decision will be, but let us not be too surprised if the CBC continues to get its way.

Just where and when the private broadcasters, and others, will figure into the television picture in Canada is anybody's guess at the present time. The present government policy is to permit one private station in each centre where the CBC establishes a station, and in any other area which the CBC itself does not want. This, of course, could mean areas that can only support a subsidiary service.

Television is regarded by many as a combination of the theatre, motion pictures and radio, but in the final analysis it is far more than the sum total of all three. Television is an artistic medium of expression in its own right, and while it can learn much from the other art forms, it also has a very distinctive and individual contribution to make on its own.

There is a certain intimacy and spontaneity to television that is not truly inherent in any other medium. For this reason, television is the most sincere and honest means of expression known to man. I doubt whether anyone present here today would be unwilling to believe that the arts (and sciences) have influenced human behaviour in less or greater degree since man's creation. From the time the first word was spoken, the first musical note sounded, man has been subjected to every known form of emotion, persuasion and abuse. Surely then, if television is the most effective means for human enlightenment, education and propaganda that the world has ever known, it must be utilized with a keen sense of responsibility and trust.

In closing, I would like to read you what I consider to be the most eloquent and sincere evaluation of television that has thus far been written. In the words of Brigadier David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America—

"Television, I believe, is destined to provide greater knowledge to larger numbers of people, truer perception of the meaning of current events, more accurate appraisal of men in public life, and broader understanding of the needs and aspirations of our fellow human beings. It also marks a beginning, I trust, of greater appreciation of the gifts of music and musicians, of art and artists, of drama and actors, and more opportunities for laughter and social companionship. It brings a beginning, I hope, of a deeper sense of spiritual values, a keener appraisal of truth, a higher development of the individuals and a wider devotion to the ideals of the free peoples of the earth. We have learned to believe in the miracles of science. Television is such a miracle. But television, if it is to fulfil its highest purpose, must begin where science leaves off and bring about new miracles, not only in machines but also in men—miracles to which the human heart as well as the human mind must contribute".

"THE PRESENT CONDITION OF ENGLAND"

An Address By

DOUGLAS JERROLD, Esq.,
Author & Publisher of London, England

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, October 13th, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

It is our great pleasure and privilege to have with us today a distinguished citizen of the British Commonwealth—Mr. Douglas Jerrold.

Some of you may be surprised to see Mr. Jerrold here in person—in as much as our notice card intimated that he had been "liquidated"—which process we have come to understand in recent years is somewhat of an ordeal.

However, we are very happy to have him with us.

From your notice card you will have read of our guest's record of service in the First World War in the Royal Navy. After being wounded at Gallipoli he became the Minister of Food in Great Britain.

Since that time he has written and published numerous books and novels, amonst others "The Necessity of Freedom",1938, "Britain and Europe", 1900-1940 and "Storm over Europe".

He is Chairman of the Board of that famous old English Publishing House—Eyre and Spottiswoode who, amongst other activities, are His Majesty's printers of the Bible.

Our guest is a great English historian. He has recently published his first volume of a historical series up to the year 1203.

It is with much pleasure that I introduce to you now Mr. Douglas Jerrold who will speak to us on THE PRESENT CONDITION OF ENGLAND!

MR. JERROLD:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: First, I have to thank you for the honour you have done me in asking me to speak to you today. It is indeed a very great privilege, and for me a very great pleasure. I am afraid it is not a pleasure which I can impart to you, but I will do my best to speak on some subject which may interest you, not on the subject announced. I am actually speaking on Britain and Europe, with the emphasis on Europe.

England today is, as we know, on the verge of a General Election. It is quite true that there has been an announcement this morning that an election will not be held immediately. That comes on top of an announcement three days ago by that great and good man, Mr. Aneurin Bevan, that there would be an immediate election.

Well, we may make of these announcements what we like, but I do not want to talk party politics; I will only say there is one thing that I think all men of all parties are agreed upon about Mr. Atlee and his colleagues, and that is that they have carried to heights never before attained by any body of men the art of affirmation by contradiction.

Despite, therefore, the fact that a prophet is greatly honoured outside his own country, I am going to disclaim the role of prophet, and I am not going to prophesy either when an election will take place or what the result will be. The internal politics of Britain will be decided by the British in the democratic way, and I will not venture to guess what their decision may be. There is one point however, on which it is safe to prophesy and that is a very important one. The foreign policy of His Majesty's Government in Great Britain will continue to be the foreign policy of His Majesty's government and not of any party, or sect, or class.

We have reached securely the state of having a bipartisan foreign policy, and that foreign policy will continue to be full co-operation with the Dominions and the United States in the defense of our common Christian

Western civilization against aggression, from whatever quarter, or in whatever democratic disguise.

But the defence of Europe, which is the common task of the nations of the West, is not altogether an easy matter, nor is it one which is fully understood in all its implications. I stress the word *Europe,* because the first point I want to make is this: That there has been in the last five or six years a dramatic change in the strategic position of my country, of Great Britain. In 1944 it was fair to say that Great Britain was the eastern outpost of the North American Continent, and the advanced base of their armies. Today Great Britain is the western outpost of the European defensive system, and instead of being the advanced base, it is the hindmost base of that defence system. The frontiers of Civilization today are the Rhine and the Danube, very historic frontiers indeed, because they are the same frontiers which defended the Roman Empire during the first three centuries of the Christian era. But the reason why the frontiers have been pushed so far forward, your frontiers as well as ours, is a fairly simple one. It is due, of course, to the invention of missile weapons. The strategy of retreat on which was based the defence of Europe against aggression from the East in the last two wars is no longer possible, and that is a very significant fact; and that of course lies behind the determination of your government and the government of the United States to take such measures as are possible for the economic recovery of Europe and its military defence. But although the facts of the new strategic situation are fully appreciated at both Ottawa and at Washington, as indeed they are also in London, it is not certain that all the implications of the new situation are fully understood. There are a number of conditions requisite to the effective defence of the West against agression from the East that are not yet fulfilled, and I want to speak to you briefly of four of these conditions.

The first concerns THE ATLANTIC PACT. The Atlantic Pact is a great step forward on the road to the united co-operative defence of the West. But it has one fatal omission. It does not include the Iberian Peninsula. I say the "Iberian Peninsula" rather than Spain, because Dr. Salazar already made it clear that the support of Portugal is very much conditioned ultimately by the position of Spain.

Now the omission of Spain from the Atlantic Pact is a serious matter for three reasons—strategic, tactical and political.

Strategically, the seriousness is obvious. Spain must necessarily be a very dominating factor in the control of the Mediterranean, and with new modern, long range weapons, any hostile power in Spain would dominate large areas of North Africa.

Tactically—and this is a point to which I think we pay far too little attention—Spain constitutes for Western Europe the only real valuable reserve of manpower, and as I shall indicate to you later, manpower is a still vitally important question.

But the third, the political objection to the omission of Spain from the Atlantic Pact, is the most serious. It is common knowledge, and indeed has been explicitly stated, that Spain is being kept out of the Atlantic Pact because we do not approve of her present constitution. Now, it is quite true that we do not; I don't suppose there is anyone in this room who approves of the present Constitution of Spain, and I do not myself, and I do not want to go on record except as disapproving of the present constitution of Spain. But, gentlemen, we can not possibly defend Europe unless Europe is united, and we can not possibly unite Europe if the price of unity is going to be a dictation from any one Nation as to the kind of constitution any other Nation is going to employ. I can well imagine a situation arising in which there were strongly anti-socialist governments in every part of Europe except Great Britain: again I can well imagine a DeGaulle regime in France, which would be detested by a Socialist government should it be returned in England. But so long as the different nations of Europe feel they are going to be subject to political censorship, you will not get any unity in Europe, which can only be united on the basis of the things that we in Western Europe have in common. The first is our common Christian Traditions, and the second our resolute determination to oppose Communism. That is the basis on which you can unite Europe, and you can not carry that basis further without imparting a fatal element of division.

I want to pass to a totally different, but by no means less important question, and that is the question of Colonial Empires of the old European countries,—Great Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands. Now it may not have been right to acquire these Colonial possessions, but we have to take the world as it is in the crisis which faces us, and we have to take the consequences of what has been done in the long past. And the chief of those consequences as they derive from the old Colonial Empires is this: that Western Europe is sustaining about twice the amount of population that it could possibly sustain without her Colonial Empires. You can never restore the economy of Western Europe if the Colonial possessions of Great Britain, France, Belgium and Holland are to fall into anarchy and cease production, nor can you ever hope to close the dollar gap again without the flow of raw materials, minerals, rubber, tea, etc., from those Far Eastern and African possessions.

Now in the United States there is, as we all know, a deep and I believe quite sincere distrust and dislike of what is called "Imperialism", so much so that a great many strings have been attached both to Marshall Aid and to the assistance now being given under the latest legislation of Congress for the rearmament of Europe. A great many strings are being attached to all that generous help, and a particular string is that nothing that is supplied from the United States is to be used in the defence or the rehabilitation of the Colonial powers of the different countries.

Now you in Canada have shared in our long Colonial experiences and you know as well as we do that the

British Colonial system of trusteeship, as it has been interpreted, has worked not for ill but for good. But even those who do not share that view must realize that in the present emergency, it is quite impossible to do anything but assist in the restoration of order in the Far East and also in the economic development of Central Africa. This is the prime condition of European economic recovery, and it can not be too often or too strongly emphasized. The alternative would be that the nations on the Western fringe of Europe would have to look forward to a long era of declining population, and the Far East to a long era of anarchy and disorder. Those are facts, and those facts must, if we are to be sane and adult citizens, be allowed to outweigh any doctrinaire prejudices.

The Third point I wish to make is perhaps the most important, and may be it is one of the most contentious, but it concerns the need for effective military preparations for the defence of Europe. Since I made the notes on which I am speaking today, the very same points have been occupying the headlines of every paper in the United States, because the high authorities in the United States Navy have felt that the time has come to say very much what I am going to say to you now, and that is that the Atom Bomb is not, and can not be, an effective weapon for the defence of Europe, either of its territory or its civilization. Those who imagine that it is possible, because of the terrible destructive powers of this new weapon, to dispense with adequate ground forces, forget the actual conditions under which that weapon would have to be used.

We know that if aggression takes place, it will not take place from this side of the Atlantic. If aggression takes place, it will come upon us from the East. I do not say it will, but if we are discussing military problems we must discuss them in the light of what is going to happen if armies and air forces have to be used, and if they have to be used, it will be because aggression has come from the East.

Now the aggressor is not going to announce he is about to aggress, keeping his whole armed forces in the neighborhood of the great Russian Supply bases. Why do you suppose Russia has been at pains to secure these vast outlying satellite territories, stretching right into the heart of Europe as far as Czechoslovakia and Berlin? The reason is perfectly obvious: because if they ever decide on aggression, they will be in a position, before they announce their intention, to start off from the centre of Europe, and if there are no ground forces to oppose them they will have their mobile mechanized forces across the Rhine and the Danube within 24 hours; and when this great weapon of the Atomic Bomb comes into play those enthusiastic air-minded strategists who will have to control it will find to their horror that their targets are not Stalingrad and Moscow but Rome, Athens and Paris, and possibly even London.

There is the picture of modern war. It is quite certain that if ground forces are not available, the Russians can cross the Brenner within 24 hours, and they can cross the Rhine within 24 hours, and at the moment ground forces are not available.

Do not think that I am decrying the power of the Atom Bomb. It may well be that if military operations went badly, if we suffered colossal military disaster as we did in 1940, it might well be that the Atom Bomb might have to be used to save Europe from a fate worse than death, but it could not possibly save Europe from death: the destruction which would be imposed by the use of that weapon would make impossible the economic recovery of Europe for many generations; as the only purpose of defending civilization is that civilization shall persist, it is useless to rely on a weapon which must inevitably mean its total eclipse.

"But", say the strategists, "what is the use of attempting to build up ground forces, because who knows what the next war is going to be like, and anything we do now will be out of date?" that is always the argument used in progressive circles for doing nothing. It is what the politicians call "statesmanship", but statesmen call it by a harder name. There is no record in history of a war which has been lost by preparing for the last war; on the contrary, wars are always lost by those who, failing to do this, inevitably make no preparation at all. If we take the last two great wars, 1914 and 1939, the immense initial successes of the German forces were due solely to the fact that they, and they alone had prepared for the last war. In 1914 they had prepared for the Russo-Japanese War, the war of entrenchments and massed field artillery, and in 1939 they had prepared for the new mechanized war which was used by the British in the Battle of Cambrai in 1917. Had the British and French in 1940 had even half the number of tanks that they employed at Cambrai in 1917, the battle of France would have been won and not lost.

We have got to realize that we have imperative obligations in this matter. The whole of history is one long lesson of the fatal and irrevocable consequences of not being prepared militarily, and there is no technical, financial or other reason why we should not be adequately prepared. Today it is a matter of will power and will power only, and a matter of instructing public opinion in the elements of the necessities of the case.

Now those are three of my points. I have only one more to which I wish to refer, and that is the question rather uppermost in a good many people's minds, of Currency. It is quite true that Europe can not recover without an adequate political unity, the Atlantic Pact. It can not recover unless its basic economy is sound, unless it can restore the flow of raw materials from its Colonial possessions. It is also true that neither political unity nor economic soundness will prevail without military preparations. But the whole of these conditions of effective security and ability for defence can be imperilled unless Europe, Western Europe, can develop a sound common currency system. You can not establish international trade in any form without a medium of exchange which is of permanent and fixed validity. After all, what does wealth consist of? Wealth does not consist of goods produced. It consists of goods available for exchange in the world's markets, and goods can never be so available, however well they are produced, unless and until you have a valid medium of exchange.

Some politicians say that if they surrender control of their own currencies, they have lost their national sovereignty. That is one of the most stupid remarks that even politicians have ever made. What value is national sovereignty, what content has the sovereignty of a country, which has to go cap in hand to Washington or Ottawa to ask for money and food to pay its troops and feed its people? That is not national sovereignty, that is dependency. It is in fact to the safeguarding of essential democratic rights that the peoples of Continental Europe shall accept a common currency which their politicians are not allowed to tamper with. Politicians who ask for free and unfettered control of their own currencies regardless of world conditions, are not asking the right to choose but the right to beg and that right is no part of the necessities of free men. Four centuries ago all the kings in Europe were engaged in clipping their coins, and most of the political troubles of the 16th and 17th centuries tended from the necessity of teaching the kings that if they did not leave the currency alone they would have to go and give place to people who could govern in a way which was consonant with economic development and freedom of trade. Most of the kings learned the lesson and the oligarchies who succeeded in the 19th century also learned that lesson, and as a result the 19th century experienced the greatest progress the world has ever known.

Democratic governments have had great virtues, they have raised the standard of living, and brought other benefits, but they have got to learn that they can not monkey about with currency. There is no valid reason whatever why they should not learn this, but until pressure is put upon them to stop this process of competitive devaluation—unless a stop will be put to this process, you will never get the stability and confidence in Europe which will energize its defence.

Well, Gentlemen, those are the four points I wish to put to you. In almost every case they are rather unpopular ones. As we all know, there are times and seasons when politicians can not say unpopular things, but those of us who have the good fortune not to be politicians have the obligation on us to say the unpopular things, and those of you who can influence large sections of public opinion also have the opportunity to say the unpopular things, because it is only through a healthy public opinion that the world will remain sane and we shall return to prosperity and peace.

"RAPID TRANSIT FOR TORONTO"

An Address By

H. W. TATE, M.B.E., B.A.Sc.
Assistant General Manager, Toronto
Transportation Commission

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, October 20th, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

I assume that I am right in stating that the very large majority of the Citizens of Toronto are proud of our Transportation Commission.

Through the years, they have served the City well and efficiently, resulting in a satisfactory financial position.

They are now embarking on a gigantic new scheme designed to maintain that quality of service which has characterised their past performance.

Your new Secretary suggested to the Speakers' Committee that probably the Members would be interested in a talk on the new Subway and on contacting Mr. Clancy—of their Public Relations—he immediately cooperated fully—and so today we have their genial Assistant General Manager, Mr. Tate, to tell his story.

Mr. Tate:

Mr. President and Gentlemen:

Personally I thank the President for his very kind words about our Transportation Commission. They are some of the kindest words I have heard lately, since we started the subway project. I was very much alarmed at being—ordered almost—to speak before this distinguished audience. I was nervous, but having looked around the audience and seen so many of my old friends, some of them fishing partners, I realize it is just an ordinary crowd, so there is nothing to be alarmed about.

I was embarrassed because Mr. Harpham's genial secretary called me up and said the President was a very punctual man, and I had to be on time. I said I had always been punctual, even for my first birthday. She argued with me about that; so I said I was there, I know I was on time.

I have no apologies in speaking on behalf of the Transportation Commission here today. We are a very important utility in this city. Last year, the year 1948, our total income was 25 million dollars; on the City System our income was 20 million dollars. And out of that we paid in wages over 15 million dollars. 62 cents out of every dollar collected on our System goes into wages.

We are an industry, a manufacturer of car miles and bus miles, and unless we produce a commodity, that is a bus mile and a street car mile, or a coach mile, which is attractive to the public, we don't sell our product. We are not like the Eaton Company and the Simpson Company. If they put on a sale and they don't sell those goods that day they can still sell them the next day. We are not in that fortunate position. If we manufacture a car mile or a bus mile today, and it is not used, we lose the money we invested in that operation.

In a year we manufacture some 38 million car, bus and coach miles. We employ over 6,100 people. And we have a very proud record in our male employees, in that over 62% of our male employees are returned veterans of the First or Second World Wars, and you will agree that is a record to be proud of.

One hundred years ago this year, public transportation started in Toronto, by a bus line running on Yonge Street from the old Red Lion Hotel north of Bloor Street, south on Yonge Street and to the St. Lawrence Market.

In 1861 the first street car, horse car system was started in Toronto, and one of the regulations or clauses in the agreement with the Company operating that street car line was that the cars were not to exceed 6 miles an hour. That was 1861. In 1949, on Yonge Street we are not exceeding six miles an hour in the rush hour. We are still living up to the regulations of 1861. In fact, during the rush hour in the winter we don't make six miles an hour. I have started level with the street car at Front and Yonge, and paced that car up as far as College, and once or twice I have caught a car that I started with at Front Street, at Bloor. Now that is not modern, attractive transportation.

In 1921 the Toronto Transportation Commission took over the operation and control, complete control, of the public transportation system in Toronto. They acquired the old Toronto Railway Company, and they took over the Civic Railways, and full power was given to the Transportation Commission to operate the system. It had to be self-supporting. Not a penny must go out of your taxes toward the operation of the railway or towards the debt charges. I say that without fear of contradiction from the City Treasurer on my left.

Starting in the fall of 1921, the Commission started to rebuild the old system. It was in a fearfully run-down condition, so run-down, in fact, that it was a sort of saying that the street cars only stayed on the track because of the pressure of the trolley wheel on the trolley wire.

One of the first lines to be rebuilt was Yonge Street, and in 1921 Yonge Street was rebuilt from Front Street to Woodlawn Avenue. I was a junior engineer at that time and had a small part in the reconstruction of Yonge Street.

The next year it was rebuilt from just south of St. Clair Avenue—the old Metropolitan radial was torn up and double-tracked to the City Limits. I am rather proud even of the small part I can claim in rebuilding Yonge Street, because the contractor is complaining very bitterly today of the strength of the concrete he has to break up in building the subway.

Anyway, when we rebuilt Yonge Street in 1921 North Toronto north of St. Clair had a population of about 12,000 people. And there were in the City of Toronto at that time about 32,000 automobiles. Today North Toronto has a population of over 80,000 people, Forest Hill has expanded and there is York Township, Leaside, East York, and North York to the north; so that double track running up Yonge Street from the Union Station to the City Limits has to serve a population of well over 100,000 people—an impossible job for that double track.

Since it has been constructed that track has carried an enormous amount of traffic, weighing about 8 million tons a year, so that those rails which were laid in 1921 have had to bear the burden of 8 million tons of traffic a year. As I said, I helped to build that track when I was considerably younger, and the track and I have aged at the same time. It has got smooth on top, its joints are wearing away, and it is more or less a skeleton of its old self.

If we wished to continue surface transportation on Yonge Street, we would have had to rebuild it almost immediately, and to rebuild Yonge Street to the City Limits, all the special track work at the various intersections, to put on new cars, and to remodel it up to date, would cost the Commission nearly 10 million dollars. And we would perpetuate for another quarter of a century slow and unattractive transportation.

The Commission, realizing that in 1942, advised City Council that as a post-war project and to relieve unemployment, they would construct a Rapid Transit line, first up Yonge Street—under it part of the way—and secondly, another east and west subway running from Trinity Park easterly to the C.N.R. east of Broadview.

We started in a very small way to study a Rapid Transit project. We just had one engineer and an assistant at first, but gradually the work of designing the subway grew, and today we have about 80 engineers and designers on the job, and before the subway is complete that number will probably be trebled or quadrupled. When they were building the Chicago subway a few years ago—it is about the same length as our proposed subway—they had something over 600 engineers on the job, but we don't expect to increase our number much beyond 200 or 250.

Most of the work, practically all of it, of designing the subway has been done by Canadian engineers. We first called in as Consultants Mr. Norman D. Wilson, who is a graduate of Toronto University, then Professor Legget was consulted on the soil conditions, Mr. Mathers and Mr. Parkin as Architects, and finally we brought into the picture Messrs. DeLeuw, Cather & Co. of Chicago to help us design the project, so that no criticism can be levelled at the Commission for not employing Canadian technical advice.

There is some criticism of letting the contract to a syndicate composed of three-fourths American contractors. When we first called for tenders, seven contractors bid for the job, and the tender was awarded to the lowest bidders for the sum of approximately $10 million. We have been criticized for not awarding the contract to an all-Canadian contractor. The nearest all-Canadian contractor's bid on the whole job was well over 60% higher than the lowest bid; so it would have meant we would have had to pay some $16 million for what we are now paying $10 million.

Further, 40% of the job will go in labour, which is practically all Canadian labour. It would have gone to them whether it is a Canadian or American contractor. 45% of the cost goes into materials, of which 50% is labour—that regardless of what contractor obtains the job, that money would have been spent in Canada—and the United States if necessary. The balance of 15% of the 100% of the job is divided into insurance, taxes and contractor's profit, so that the American interest—3/4ths of the successful tenderer's, will just get three-fourths of the contractor's profit. And as a number of their principals are in Canada a lot of the time, they have to spend money in Canada, so it would appear if they are successful in their work and make a profit, which I hope they will, that a comparatively small amount will leave the country.

Now I would like to use the lantern, Mr. President, and go over the slides very quickly and explain the location of the subway.

Slides followed, of which the speaker spoke as follows:—

These slides are historical. There is Yonge Street north from King, 1879.

There is a corner of King and Yonge, and here is Michie's—1900.

Here is a picture of the good old days when the Toronto Railway Company gave you six tickets for a quarter. You got properly air-conditioned in travelling.

Another slide (historical).

Another slide, in which the speaker drew attention to the styles of the early days.

That is the type of street car equipment the Commission took over from the Toronto Railway Company—1891—1921.

That is the heavy Witt car now in service on Yonge Street, which the Commission purchased in 1922. It is obsolete compared with our modern car, and therefore if we continued our surface transportation, we would have to replace it.

This is a new P.C.C. street car. We will have by the end of November 489 of these new streamlined cars. When we purchased the first car in 1938 we paid approximately $23,000 a-piece. The latest car you now see operating on Bloor Street costs $40,000 a-piece.

This is Yonge Street at the City Limits in 1922, when the Commission replaced the old Metropolitan carline and extended the double track City System up to the City Limits. You are looking south on Yonge Street. There is the corner of Duplex and Eglinton Avenues in 1922.

That is Eglinton and Duplex—the street car division car house under construction in 1922. If you look west you will see there is practically not a house in sight.

Now this is the reason that we can not give you good service on Yonge Street. In the maximum hour between 5 and 6 o'clock we have to carry between 13,000 and 14,000 people north on Yonge Street, the heaviest travelled street car line in North America. In fact, we carry on Yonge Street in the rush hour more people than are carried in the maximum hour on one of the Boston subway systems operated by surface car.

This is a chart showing the flow of traffic from the downtown area in Toronto in the maximum 3 hours. The chart is drawn to scale. You can see by the width of the flow diagram the volume of traffic being carried up Yonge Street, and how heavy this traffic is compared with the other north and south or the east and west lines.

Here is our proposal. The Yonge Street subway starts at the Union Station, goes under Front Street to Yonge, curves under the Bank of Montreal buildings. It then carries north to College, where it switches over to the east and parallels Yonge Street about 175 feet east, and continues on the eastern side of Yonge Street to St. Clair, then it goes on the west side of Yonge Street and continues on the west side of Yonge Street as far as Eglinton. The subway is a structure underground to a point north of Severn Street, where it comes out in the open and stays in the open to Pleasant Boulevard, and then goes underground and stays underground, passing under the Muir Memorial Gardens, comes out at this point and stays in the open until it reaches Berwick Avenue. It then goes underground until it reaches the northerly terminal at Eglinton where there will be a subway terminal and a terminal for all the surface lines coming from the east and west.

The Eglinton terminal is so designed, in case we find it necessary to extend the subway line further north, that it can be done without destroying any of the structure which will be built now. Furthermore, at the south end, at the Union Station, the tunnel is so designed that if we wish to extend it westerly and up University Avenue, no part of the structure will be destroyed.

This is only a sort of cartoon, but it gives you some idea of the quantities and the size of this project. To carry away the excavation requires a train of 400 miles in length. A train 50 miles long would be required to carry sand and gravel, to bring in the backfill, a train 150 miles long. To bring in the steel and cement and lumber requires a train of 17 miles. So you can see that the construction of this work will give a great deal of work to industries in Ontario surrounding Toronto, and wider areas than that; it is not just a local project.

The subway is a box structure. It is built of reinforced concrete. In between stations it is 32′6″ in width by a little more than 18′ in depth, and at stations 52 feet wide by about 19′3″. There are two separate tunnels for the north and southbound traffic. At the station there are no columns on the platform at all, so there is uninterrupted movement on the platforms. The station platforms are designed to be 500 feet in length to accommodate a 10 car train of 45 foot cars.

Now this is how our engineers thought that the subway would be built, and actually it is being built along these lines. On either side you will notice these two upright columns—those soldier piles or big steel members that you see being driven on either side of Yonge Street with so much noise.

Those piles are 12″ H members weighing about 65 pounds to the foot, and are driven approximately 8 feet below the bottom of the subway structure. Downtown, south of Adelaide Street, they are driven to rock. They are driven by that pile driver which gives about 145 blows to the minute. In the centre of that picture you will see a red oval-shaped object. That is the main sewer on Yonge Street. To allow us to take that sewer out, the City built a new sewer down Victoria Street, so we can remove that sewer. We have yet to arrange with the City as to what price we will have to pay for that sewer, for they say it is only seventy years old, and a sewer, like wine, improves with age.

The soldier pile driven, and a cross-beam has been erected from top to top of those piles, and the ground excavated underneath.

Now a temporary roadway has been laid on that beam, street car traffic has returned to surface, and the contractor will carry on work underneath. All the public utility facilities have been suspended to the lower part of that cross-beam.

There you have a truss to support the roadway, and digging out the temporary piles in the centre, and the excavations will be carried down.

Now the excavation has been carried down to the bottom; planks have been placed between the soldier piles so as to hold up the side of the excavation. Now they have built the structures of the subway. Here is the centre wall and the side walls and the platform on the side. The subway has been completed, the ground backfilled, the public utilities replaced, and the street repaved, and no sign of the old street car tracks. We are now coming to up-to-date pictures. The opening ceremony of the driving of the first pile on Yonge Street, just south of Wellington.

Here is the pile being driven, with the Lt.-Governor in attendance.

There is a clam shell bucket right opposite our head office, so that we are suffering along with all the other residents on Yonge Street.

There is a pile driver at work on Front Street. You are looking at the Royal York Hotel.

There is the backhoe excavating after the street surface has been removed.

There is a pile driver at work, and you can see the kind of helmets all workmen have to wear, crash helmets, to protect themselves.

There is the excavation, and as our right-of-way curves under the Bank of Montreal, you can see the curve going to the westerly side of Yonge Street.

Here are soldier piles being driven. Here is the planking to support the excavation.

Here are the cross-beams being placed to support the temporary roadway. Those beams are only in temporarily and when the structure has been completed and backfill replaced, those beams will be removed and salvaged.

Here are shown three of these cross-beams, and then to support the temporary roadway they are using Douglas fir 12″ x 12″ sections, and those will be spiked together and traffic run over them.

This shows it a little more completed, and a space is left in the centre of the temporary pavement to accommodate the street car tracks which will be temporarily relaid. These cross pieces of steel placed there in between the cross-beams which, by the way, are 36″ in depth, are located where the four rails of the temporary track run. They will be under each of the rails.

Now we have been somewhat criticized for not rushing the work and carrying on 24 hours a day. These are the various public utilities underneath the city pavement, and the various utilities say it is not possible to do a lot of their work of handling these cables during the night.

There it shows again some of the obstructions underneath, some of the city pavement we are running into. Fortunately we are not in as bad a condition as this street in New York where there was a subway under construction. That shows you how fully occupied the street is underneath the pavement.

That is not a very clear scene, but that is one of the transfer stations between the surface point and the subway at Wellesley.

There is the transfer station at Bloor Street and Yonge. To get that transfer station we have to widen Bloor Street at Yonge, so that passengers can leave the Bloor street cars and walk down to the subway station underneath.

That is the Eglinton Station. Into that station will come the surface operations. There will be no street cars from the City Limits any more, but into that station will come buses from Forest Hill, Leaside, East York, North York and the townships to the north. They will all come into that surface station, and passengers will be able to walk down directly into the subway terminal.

This is a model of a mezzanine station we constructed in our building so as to study the layout of a mezzanine station. It is built to full size, the half of a station, so that the lighting, ticket collecting and concessions could be studied by all the officials.

This is just a sort of little preview of what Yonge St. may look like when the street car tracks are removed. That is a street in Boston. The car tracks were removed. The street was not widened, but it gives you the appearance of having doubled in width.

This shows you the interest taken in our project by one of the big stores uptown. I am afraid, Mr. President, it is Eaton's. It is the Sidewalk Superintendents' group, and all those figures you see on the screen are models showing up the various products of the Eaton Co.

That is a view of another window.

Mr. Tate concluded, saying, "Gentlemen, I hurried through this, Mr. President, because you told me I had to get through by 1.30 or as soon as possible thereafter. It has been a very short story of our subway, and I hope I have covered most of the principal points.

Thank you very much indeed."

"THE ROLE OF THE OPPOSITION IN PARLIAMENT"

AN ADDRESS BY

JOHN G. DIEFENBAKER, K.C., M.P.
MEMBER FOR LAKE CENTRE, SASK.

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. SYDNEY HERMANT

Thursday, October 27th, 1949

MR. HERMANT:

Fellow Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada: We are to be privileged to hear an Address to-day by John Diefenbaker, K.C., Member of Parliament representing Lake Centre, Sask. A fourth-generation Canadian on both sides, John Diefenbaker was born in Grey County, Ontario. He received his primary schooling at the Plains Rd. School in East Toronto.

His family having moved to Saskatchewan Mr. Diefenbaker continued his education there, graduating from the University of Saskatchewan with the Degree of M.A. in Political Science, having financed *himself* by doing farm work and teaching—He is presently a Member of the Senate of the University. Immediately upon Graduation John Diefenbaker enlisted with the 196th Western University Battalion serving Overseas until invalided home in 1917, following which he studied Law at the University of Saskatchewan and was admitted to the Bar in 1919. He hung out his shingle in Wakaw, Sask., *and* at the age of 25 was recognized as a brilliant Counsel. In 1924 he moved to Prince Albert, becoming a King's Counsel in 1929. For a time he was the Leader of the Provincial Conservative Party in the Province of Saskatchewan.

John Diefenbaker is a keen student of World Affairs. a great believer in the Commonwealth and Empire, and a stout defender of Human Rights.

Canadians of all Political Parties and from all walks of Life respect him as a fearless, fair, and constructive critic of the present Government, and *all* deeply appreciate *a* man of his character and capacity devoting himself to Public Service.

Mr. Diefenbaker's subject *to-day* is *"The Role of the Opposition* in Parliament"——Mr. Diefenbaker.

MR. DIEFENBAKER:

In the development of our British Parliamentary system of government "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" is a necessary part. Without it the House of Commons for the last three hundred years would not have been the bulwark of freedom.

The name "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" originated in 1826 when Mr. Hobhouse, afterwards Lord Broughton, while engaged in an attack on Mr. Canning used these words:—

"It is said to be hard on His Majesty's Ministers to raise objections of this character but it is more hard on His Majesty's Opposition to compel them to take this course."

Canning welcomed the expression and stated:—

"My Right Honourable friend could not have invented a better phrase to designate us than that which he adopted. That we are certainly to all intents and purposes a branch of His Majesty's Government its proceedings for some time past have proven. Although with the gentlemen opposite in office, we are in power, the measures are ours but the emoluments are theirs". "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition" has been since then the designation given to the alternative party in the House of Commons. The role of the Opposition is an integral and important element of the constitutional organization of Parliament. Its leader receives the same salary as does a Cabinet Minister and in Britain so important is his position tht he stands on the side of the Prime Minister at the opening of Parliament.

The Opposition that fulfills its functions makes as important a contribution to the preservation of the Parliamentary system as does the government of the day. Its functions are comprehensive and important and cannot and must not be limited to the definition given by Tierney one hundred and twenty years ago when he contended that: "The duty of an Opposition is to propose nothing, to oppose everything and to turn out the government."

I know of no better epitome of the House of Commons than the words used by Jennings in his work on Parliament:

"It holds its Opposition partly because of its great traditions. It has fought kings and dismissed them. It has raised up an army to destroy a king and was itself destroyed by its army; only to recall another kind and to rise up again on the site of its own destruction. It has been modified and reformed to meet the changes of centuries. It has been led by the greatest men that the country has produced—Pitt the Elder and Pitt the Younger, Sir Robert Peel, Disraeli and Gladstone, Lloyd George; it has seen the greatest wits and orators in opposition to each other; it has, above all, achieved the pinnacle of freedom by listening to men like Charles James Fox, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Lloyd George and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Churchill who dared to be unpopular and, in the cant phrase, "unpatriotic", because they insisted on speaking the truth as they understood it."

If Parliament is to be preserved as a living institution His Majesty's Loyal Opposition must fearlessly perform its functions. When it properly discharges them the preservation of our freedom is assured. The reading of history proves that freedom always dies when criticism ends. It upholds and maintains the rights of minorities against majorities. It must be vigilant against oppression and unjust invasions by the Cabinet of the rights of the people. It should supervise all expenditures and prevent over expenditure by exposing to the light of public opinion wasteful expenditures or worse. It finds fault; it suggests amendments; it asks questions and elicits information; it arouses, educates and molds public opinion by voice and vote. It must scrutinize every action by the government and in doing so prevents the short-cuts through democratic procedure that governments like to make.

Parliament is a place where in full discussion freedom is preserved, where one side advances arguments and the other examines them and where decisions are arrived at after passing through the crucible of public discussion.

The Opposition that discharges its responsibilities becomes the responsible outlet of intelligent criticism. Indeed, most, if not all, authorities on constitutional government agree that Britain's freedom from civil war since the development of the party system is due in the main to the fact that the Opposition has provided an outlet and a safety-valve for opposition.

I am fully aware that parliamentary majorities are not prone to acknowledge the necessity of the Opposition—and more so when the Opposition fully and competently discharges its constitutional functions. One political writer has expressed the view of the average government in these words:

"The Government tends to regard the Opposition as the brake on a car going uphill whereas the Opposition thinks the car is going downhill."

The critical question is often asked as to why the need of two sides in Parliament, one to propose and the other to oppose. The simple answer is that the experience of history has been that only a strong and fearless Opposition can assure preservation of our fundamental freedoms and of the rights of the individual against executive and bureaucratic invasions of those rights. Quintin Hogg, an outstanding member of the British Parliament has given the answer in these words: "Countries cannot be fully free until they have an organized Opposition. It is not a long step from the absence of an organized Opposition to a complete dictatorship."

The Opposition cannot oppose without reason. Its alternative policies must be responsible and practicable for it has a responsibility to the King to provide the alternative government to the one in power. Without an Opposition decision by discussion would end and be supplanted by virtual dictatorship for governments tend to prefer rule by order-in-council to Parliament and bureaucrats prefer to be uncontrolled by Parliament or the courts.

The responsibility of the Opposition has been greatly increased for in the last few years the Cabinets in the various Parliaments of the British Commonwealth have recovered most of the powers lost two hundred years ago. It must not be forgotten that Parliament gave up many of its rights during the days of war and allowed fundamental freedoms to be abrogated. These rights were given up as security for victory. These freedoms must be restored and only with a strong Opposition is restoration certain.

It is human nature for governments to find the Opposition distasteful and the longer governments are in power the more they become convinced that they govern by Divine Right and that their decisions are infallible. Only a strong Opposition can prevent a Cabinet with a commanding majority from ruling without regard to the rights of minorities. Independence is not looked for among most private members supporting the government, for individual independence more often than not denies personal preferment. As for collective independence by the members supporting the government, the Cabinet is master by holding over its majority the threat of dissolution.

The absence of a strong Opposition means a one party state. A one party state means an all-powerful Cabinet. It is as true in the twentieth century as it was in the nineteenth when Lord Acton wrote:

"All power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

There have been tremendous changes in government in the last fifty years but it is nonetheless true now as it was at the beginning of this century that only with an organized and effective Opposition can democracy be preserved. Canada's freedom and destiny is in the custody of the Opposition no less than it is of the Government. Government has become so complex and its ramifications so extensive that no matter how industrious a member of Parliament may be, it is impossible to master all the problems that come before Parliament and more so in that there are not available to the Opposition the trained civil servants who are at the disposal of the government at all times. In my opinion the Opposition will not be able to discharge its duty unless it has available to it trained and outstanding research experts whose salaries will be paid by the state.

An Opposition does not properly perform its functions unless it examines all expenditures made with a searching eye and with fearless criticism, yet Members of the House of Commons have no proper facilities to enable the full examination of the Public Accounts and Estimates. Debates on Estimates are futile. An expenditure of millions of dollars that are totally unjustified could conceivably be passed without much danger of detection. Canadians have become so used to the expenditure of billions that a million here or there seems of little consequence. I believe that the Public Accounts Committee should be modelled after the British Committee wherein the majority of members belong to the Opposition party and the chairman is an Opposition member. Under our practice and it has been continued for several decades, the Public Accounts Committee is under the Chairmanship of a supporter of the government as are the majority of the Committee and, in consequence, a critical examination of wasteful expenditure is not encouraged.

If Parliament is to be made as effective an instrument in the modern world as it should be the procedure of Parliament should be modernized and brought up to date. The trend in consequence of two wars in one generation has been in the direction of by-passing Parliament by the passing of orders-in-council which interfere with individual rights under order-in-council which too often deny the right of appeal to the court. There should be a standing committee of the House of Commons whose responsibility it would be to vigilantly examine and report on all orders-in-council that diminish the freedom of the individual.

If such a committee performed no other function it would make the people of Canada Parliament-conscious.

While Parliament has its short-comings it remains the bulwark of our freedom. It has been described by Quintin Hogg in these words:

> "Parliament is not like a building designed and constructed by a single architect such as the Parthenon, St. Paul's Cathedral, or the Empire State Building. Parliament resembles rather an ancient family mansion which has been lived in continuously for a period of centuries, and has served the needs of those that have dwelt therein by constantly modifying and adding to its conveniences from generation to generation. In the centre there may be a Norman keep—largely deserted now but giving its name to the whole and revered and venerated as the most ancient part of the building, and dating from the days when defence was the main object of architecture.
>
> Hard by is the Tudor Wing—still serviceable and reflecting a period when first comfort began to take precedence over security. The Jacobean façade is the keynote of the whole, and the great staircase was the scene of a bloody encounter in the days of the Civil Wars. In Queen Anne's day they added a portico, and the great library dates from the Hanoverian period. The Victorian additions are commodious and well-built but somewhat ugly, while

> somewhere at the back scaffolding and a pile of bricks announce that something new is still being added to suit the needs of the present times. The whole has served the family well for generations of happy and vigorous life, but it baffles the planner to reduce its form to any single conception.
>
> To those who live in it, it is a priceless possession not to be exchanged for anything more meretricious and unified. But those who are unfamiliar with its history are sometimes apt to lose themselves in its winding corridors and to be surprised and trapped by floors built at different times and on separate levels."

Parliament must continue to be the custodian of freedom. To that end it must constantly change its procedure to meet the changing needs of a modern world but must be changeless in its concept and tradition. Parliament will only remain the guardian of freedom and our free institutions so long as His Majesty's Loyal Opposition is fully responsible and effective in the discharge of its functions.

"THE FARMER TAKES A HAND IN WORLD AFFAIRS"

An Address By

H. H. HANNAM, C.B.E., B.S.A.

President, The Canadian Federation
of Agriculture

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, November 3rd, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

Our guest speaker today has for many years been a great figure in the agricultural world—both nationally and internationally.

The notice cards give very little information regarding his quite remarkable career in that field, so I will briefly touch on the highlights.

From 1928 to 1943 Mr. Hannam held the following important positions:

Secretary Treasurer of the United Farms of Ontario.

Secretary of the United Farmers Co-operative Company.

Vice-President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture; later being appointed President.

In 1943 when the Canadian Delegation to the United Nations Food Conference was appointed, Mr. Hannam was included in an advisory capacity and later with the Canadian Delegation attended at each of the subsequent conferences at Quebec, Copenhagen, Geneva and Washington.

In 1946 in the King's Honour List Mr. Hannam was created a Commander of the Order of the British Empire —C.B.E.

In his spare moments he has written and published several books on this important subject.

I will now ask Mr. Hannam to speak on his chosen subject

"The Farmer takes a hand in World Affairs"

Mr. Hannam:

You might expect me to tell you that agriculture is our basic industry in Canada, and that when the farmer is prosperous everybody else is doing very well.

Say it this way. Many of you here represent big business, that is, so-called big business. The biggest big business in Canada is agriculture.

Farming is still the largest single industry in our Dominion unless you lump all manufacturing together and include the packing industry, milling and other processing of farm products.

There are more than one million workers engaged in agriculture.

But the fact of particular significance for our subject today has to do with the world market:

For the past 5 years agriculture provided 30% of Canada's total exports.

Before the war (5 year period) agriculture provided 39% of total exports.

From 1943-47 we exported—

85% of our wheat and flour,
73% ” ” cheese
39% ” ” hogs
45% ” ” wool
24% ” ” apples
20% ” ” eggs

Exports are important in our national picture. Vital to our whole Canadian economy. If world trade breaks down you will realize the jam we'll be in.

This Dominion has its roots deep in the soil.

The production and distribution of food is perhaps the world's greatest problem today. Why?

Because: (a) More of the world's people are engaged in feeding the human family than in any other occupation, and,

(b) The food one gets means the difference between starved bodies and unbalanced minds on the one hand, or healthy bodies and healthy mental outlook on the other.

Following is the message of one of the great men of our day—Lord Boyd Orr:

> "Hunger and poverty lead to social unrest and revolution. A successful world food plan can put the world on the road to permanent peace."

For his lifetime crusade behind that idea, he has been awarded this year's Nobel Peace Prize—a fitting recognition of his outstanding contribution to world history.

Ever since President Roosevelt took the initiative in calling the first food conference at Hot Springs (in 1943) world nations and statesmen have been trying to develop a world food program. And they are still working on it.

Some definite progress has been made and strangely enough farmers have had a hand in it. Plain everyday farmers have been contributing the benefit of their experience and their vision to world statesmen on the subject of "food and agriculture."

What the farmer has done and how, is, I think, what you may expect me to outline briefly to you today.

Fourteen years ago this month farmer representatives from all nine provinces in Canada gathered in Toronto. They met to consider organizing on a national basis—and they *organized* the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

Their aim was:

> To establish a Federation which could speak with one voice for Canadian agriculture,
>
> To enable farmers to play their full part in a capable and dignified manner in the affairs of the nation,
>
> To make farm life and rural living compare favourably with that enjoyed by urban people, and to

maintain a high standard of rural citizenship.

That their efforts have been fairly successful you probably have heard. With all branches of agriculture and all provinces included, the Federation of Agriculture has an affiliated membership of some 400,000—approximately 60 to 65 per cent of Canadian farmers.

The recognition which has been accorded the Federation and its program prompted the Federal Minister of Agriculture to state in an address on one occasion last year:

> "Never before in the history of Canadian agriculture has the voice of agriculture been more effectively and and unitedly expressed than during the past six years."

Once we established a national office in the capital, and our farmers, through conferences, advisory committee meetings and continuous contacts with Federal Ministers and senior officials, became thoroughly conversant with national policies, they realized more keenly than ever before how vitally important had international policies become in determining the shape of our agricultural program at home and the level of farm income. In fact they came to the conclusion that no agricultural country such as Canada could carry out successfully a stable agricultural program domestically unless that program harmonized with a jointly sponsored program by world nations in the international field.

This thought shared by the farmers in many countries, led three years ago to the holding of the first world farmers' conference in London, England, and to the formation of a farmers' international federation—the International Federation of Agricultural Producers. So it is that our Canadian farmers have joined hands with the organized farmers of 23 other lands and, ignoring oceans, are determined to work with them, *TO:*

1. Better look after the interests of agriculture,
2. Better fulfil their task of feeding the world, and more specifically at this time, attempt to do their

part in establishing an adequate world food program.

Our Federation was honoured this year by being given the opportunity to act as hosts, at Guelph, to the Third Annual Conference of IFAP.

Now that world farmers have a voice, you may properly ask: what do they want and what do they recommend?

Our Canadian farmers want to put agriculture on a business basis.

Until the last five or six years our farmers had never enjoyed the satisfaction of producing for a known market and to them this is very important for the future. The farmer wants to know that the costs which he incurs from month to month will have a reasonably good chance of being recovered when his product goes to market at the end of the season, the next year or the year after that. In other words, farmers want some assurance of stability in markets projected ahead a few years to enable them to plan their production with confidence. With this view, we found the farmers of all countries in complete agreement.

This desire for systematic and stable marketing is basic in the reasoning of world farmers in recommending international commodity agreements, of which the International Wheat Agreement is a typical example.

At three annual conferences our IFAP came out unanimously in support of a wheat agreement. And there is reason to believe that such an agreement, which went into effect on August 1st last, would not have been achieved had it not been for the existence and support of our world farmers' organization.

Under this agreement five exporting nations undertake to sell and thirty-seven importing nations undertake to buy 456 million bushels of wheat (Canada, 203 millions) during a four year period with a top ceiling of $1.80 and a bottom floor of $1.20. This agreement gives wheat growers new incentive to produce without fear.

Another recommendation on which world farmers agree is that efforts should be made to insure reasonable stability in prices. Our farmers are not, nor ever have been, advocates merely of high prices. They believe that moderate prices in proper balance in the various sectors of our economy are best. They have seen unduly low prices ruin producers and unduly high prices create hardship for consumers and kill a market. They have been widely fluctuating prices bedevil market operations and destroy that confidence without which trade cannot flourish.

Consequently they believe in establishing a floor and ceiling price by mutual agreement, leaving a substantial margin between the two to provide optimum freedom for supply and demand factors to function.

In the wheat agreement there is a margin of 30 to 50 cents per bushel between agreed upon floor and ceiling prices. In recommending such agreements we are not advocating price fixing nor state trading. We are advocating international, i.e., inter-governmental, agreement to lay down rules within which trading can function freely, on a basis considered best for all concerned.

If the wheat agreement proves successful in the few years immediately ahead—years which are likely to place it under severe test—we will have discovered a new pattern for world trade with tremendous possibilities for the future. If it doesn't succeed, well, it's not likely to be worse than the breakdown and chaos we experienced in the thirties. While it is a new idea, farmers believe it's worth trying.

One other matter of policy is involved in this program. It is that farmers believe in a policy of abundant production. They have not at any conference suggested restricting production in order to maintain profitable prices for themselves.

This policy of abundant and expanding production is one that is most fundamental in the program of the U.N. food and Agricultural Organization.

In respect to food, Canada is a fortunate country and we Canadians a privileged people. With all the abundance we have in this country it is difficult to appreciate the seriousness of food shortage in the world food picture; yet for millions in many countries (and for those nations) hunger is a stark reality. In 1949 world production of food overtook the prewar volume but with a net increase of 200 million people there is less per capita than before the war.

In underdeveloped countries FAO has done a fine job of helping them to expand production.

For the agricultural exporting countries FAO's big problem is not so much one of inducing increased production as it is of seeing that methods of distribution and purchasing power on the part of food consumers can keep in step with or slightly in advance of desirable and continuous expansion in production.

For agricultural producers, such as ours in Canada the question is: dare we risk abundance? Instinctively our farmers would produce for plenty and they realize the world needs it badly *but* they remember all too vividly the tragic experiences of the past with unwanted surpluses, and have grave fears, that without due safeguards, expanding production may bring only a repetition of past disasters. Since producers see some surpluses already piling up and danger of more serious ones in the near future what should be done? Many countries, U.S., Canada, also European countries, are now seriously concerned about where they will find a market for their surpluses above domestic requirements.

Our Canadian Federation put a proposal for moving embarassing surpluses into consumption before the IFAP conference at Guelph and it was unanimously endorsed. It proposed the setting up of an international agency and fund to take surpluses, arrange for their sale to needy peoples at special prices, and have the loss shared between the fund and the supplying country.

Two days after our IFAP conference closed, our Secretary was in Paris putting our recommendations before the Food Council of FAO. They set up a committee of experts to consider these and similar proposals. The committee met in August and September and their report endorsed by the Director-General of FAO, recommends establishing an international agency (to be called the International Commodity Clearing House) and fund to move surpluses into consumption in a manner somewhat similar to that which we had proposed. In fact the FAO proposal goes even farther than 'ours, because the agency, ICCH, which they suggest is designed to be a double-barrelled affair—a clearing house both for surplus commodities and for inconvertible currencies. That proposal is now before the 58 member governments of FAO. It will likely be the main item on the agenda of the FAO General Conference which opens in Washington on the twenty-first of this month.

It suggests two procedures, one the sale of surplus commodities to needy countries at special prices as we had done, but with the fund assuming the loss involved, the second selling at normal market prices to be paid in soft currencies, with the Clearing House, holding that currency to the credit of the supplying country until such time as that currency becomes convertible.

Our IFAP had proposed a coordinating body for international commodity agreements. FAO recommends that the ICCH should be such coordinating agency.

The real danger is that if some such plan as this is not agreed upon, each country will approach the problem from a purely national point of view. That could result in a renewal of dumping, cut-throat competition and narrow nationalistic tariff policies. If there is no order by means of an international approach the result could be disastrous perhaps as bad or worse than that of the thirties.

If Canada supports the FAO plan, we will have to contribute our share of the fund agreed upon. There will be some opposition to that. *But* if we get into another depression without any international plan to help take up the shock what will it cost us in subsidies, giving away surpluses at 100 per cent loss, curtailing and restricting production, exploiting our soil, dwindling purchasing power in agriculture, then in industry, then in unemployment, high costs for unemployment insurance, strained finances, bankruptcies, and not unlikely social unrest. In the aggregate what will such a situation cost all nations together? Perhaps far more than it would to support a plan such as FAO's. Some will say we can't afford to do it. I wonder if we can afford not to do it.

In any case I am convinced the next great step forward in human history will be that of the world feeding itself by means of an orderly, organized, international plan. I believe that's the real basis for both peace and plenty.

"BETWEEN THE IRON AND THE ICE CURTAIN"

AN ADDRESS BY

ROBERT W. KEYSERLINGK
PRESIDENT, CAMPION PRESS LIMITED

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. SYDNEY HERMANT

Thursday, November 10th, 1949

MR. HERMANT:

Members and Guests of The Empire Club of Canada:

We are to hear an Address to-day by Mr. Robert W. Keyserlingk, President and Managing Director of the Campion Press Limited in Montreal, and former General Manager and Managing Editor of the British United Press.

He was born in St. Petersburg, son of Count Henry Keyserlingk, Commander in the Imperial Russian Navy. When his father was transferred from the Baltic to the Pacific Fleet during the Great War the family moved to Vladivostok. When the Russian Revolution broke out they fled to Japan. Mr. Keyserlingk attended the St. Joseph's College at Yokohama, and the Canadian Academy at Kobe. Later he lived in China. He came to Canada in 1925 and graduated from the University of British Columbia in Political Science.

For eight years Mr. Keyserlingk was foreign correspondent for the British United Press and the United Press in various European Capitals spending four years as General European Manager with headquarters in London, England.

Mr. Keyserlingk is presently publishing *The Ensign,* a weekly newspaper, complimentary copies of which will be available to Members and Guests of the Club at the end of this meeting. His latest book *"Unfinished History"* published by Messrs. Robert Hale of London, England, is receiving wide acclaim.

Recently returned from an extended trip throughout Europe, Mr. Keyserlingk will now address us on the subject "Between the Iron and the Ice Curtains"—Mr. Keyserlingk.

MR. KEYSERLINGK:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: When, about eighteen months ago, I had the privilege of addressing this Club I was discussing certain problems which were facing us at the time and which now have found at least a temporary solution. At that time, we were looking at the world largely consisting of three different spheres. There was the *free world,* in which Canada held a privileged position. There was an *inbetween world,* an area for which both the free world and the world of Communist domination were putting in a bid, one for liberty, the other for slavery. Thirdly, there was the ever vaster Red Empire.

Today I am afraid we have to say that the three have become two, for what was at that time still an area across which the influences of both ideologies, the economic and political influences and attractions, were able to compete, has more or less disappeared. If we look to Europe, we will find that a large number of millions have lost their freedom, and the Iron Curtain has become in every sense a separation.

It is true that in those days there were also certain countries whose future was indefinite. I am referring particularly to countries like Italy, to countries like France, where political divisions were threatening any movement, any attempts at establishment of democratic government. The decision by vote of their people have ranged them alongside the few remaining countries of the Free Western World.

On the other hand, the losses have also been great. The fate of Czechoslovakia and Hungary has been sealed, and what is far more important, in size, in influence, and in its future potentialities, is the fact that that vast subcontinent of China has also to be counted for an additional 400 million people have today the Iron Curtain, which first stretched across Europe, also stretched for them along the coast of the Pacific.

I mentioned in the title "The Ice Curtain." We have moved ahead rapidly in Air Transport. Both commercial as well as military aviation have increased their developments, have made great strides. That has obviously made the Northland ever more important. We have all seen projections of new maps, new as against the maps that you and I saw in our school days. Across Canada's north, and across the Arctic the route to the Orient, and the route to Europe have been shortened both in miles and also by much more favorable flying weather in time.

We have in Canada the home of some international aviation organizations. The emphasis in their studies in meteorological observations in the Northland is natural, but it is greatly hampered. We have actually stretching across the Arctic a veritable *ice curtain*, which is impenetrable.

We know, largely by hearsay, some of it may be by intelligence, that Soviet Russia has made tremendous strides in the development of Northern Siberia. Going right back to the early 30's, we remember the name of a man like Professor Schmidt, of the Soviet Meteorological Service. They have been making great strides. Some of their projects have studded the path with misery and suffering. The fate of the people of the Baltic States was sealed when Soviet Russia occupied them after the war, but what has happened to these people since is only partly known. The details will may-be not be known for a long time, but it is safe to take this part of their fate as factual information. The policy pursued by the Soviet State of defending itself against infiltration of ideas, against the dangers of our freedom being known by their people, have led to a depopulation policy which goes back to the ages of savagery for a precedent. Millions of people have been deported from countries like Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, even from Poland. They have been sent as forced "colonists" into the northern regions, where, thanks to their hardy physiques but mainly because of the terror which drove them, they are supposed to be opening up and settling in the regions along the Rivers Ob, Yeniner, Lena and Kolyma. There has been a shift of population up into that Siberian Northland. At the same time from the strategic point of view it has given military preparations there a certain human hinterland.

The fact that the North is attracting attention on both sides is known to all of us. But it is important to note that it has certainly moved Canada into a very special position. We might be separated from the actual iron curtain, be it by the Pacific Ocean, or be it by the intermediary countries of Europe from the Iberian Peninsula through to the middle of Germany. But along the ice curtain we are Soviet Russia's closest riparian. That has created a position for Canada from the purely military point of view which places us on the shortest route between Moscow and Washington.

The North has a very special significance, for it is known that weather conditions are best for flying, clear weather is more frequent, the various atmospheric disturbances of the more moderate moister zones in the Northern climates do not exist.

We can think back to the time of the war when great activity was developed not only by our side but also by the Germans in trying to place meterological observation posts in the North. Thanks to the planning and to the ability of our Military Command it was possible for us to determine, by having our posts in the northland, the weather in Berlin before bombing forays and long before even the Germans would know what their own weather would be tomorrow. In other words, the North land also has the added importance of being the place where weather is determined for the weather man.

In any case, in distance, as well as due to the meteorological possibilities and because of flying having become so important, Canada's northern boundary is one which is attracting increasing interest, not only on our part, but also on the part of others. I think it is therefore safe to say that Canada finds herself today placed in a position as exposed in the preservation of her liberties as any of the countries in the world.

We have made tremendeous strides in the responsibilities which have been placed on Canada's shoulders in the international field. The activities of Canada's delegates at international conferences, the economic assistance and participation of Canada has been increased. Also the military co-operation of Canada, both through the Atlantic Pact as well as through separate agreements and arrangements in mutual defence between the United States and Canada have made the actual area of Canada a strategic area in more than one respect.

Those are the physical aspects, or let us say, the geographic aspects of the situation. The last eighteen months have changed things considerably, for as I said before, in those days we had political buffer countries, or areas between the East and West. The buffers have disappeared.

In many of those areas the final decisions have not yet come. I had an opportunity before coming here today, thanks to the excellent system of your Club of keeping records of what speakers said, to look at some of the problems which I had the opportunity of discussing with you eighteen months ago. We were looking forward at that time to the decision to settle some of the European problems in the form of a peace treaty with Germany, a peace treaty with Austria and certain changes in the status of India.

There is no peace treaty with our former enemies yet, but in the meantime while the old difficulties of war have not yet been settled, new ones have appeared. If one only thinks of the international conferences, and tries to abstract an idea of a general trend, I think it does not take any undue pessimism or cynicism to say that what had been hardly friendly eighteen months ago has today flared up in open antagonism between the two sides.

And here I would like to refer to a most ominous statement which I think came out of Moscow on the occasion of their 30th anniversary of the Revolution when no less a person than Mr. Malenkov stands up and declares that a 3rd world war would mean the destruction of our

Western Society. If one reads this in context with the party line which has always been adhered to as proclaimed by Lenin and reiterated only recently in the statement and in the works of Stalin, which were published in 18 volumes during the last few months, one learns that the co-existence of our society and the Communist regime is impossible. For Communists it is axiomatic that either the one or the other will survive. Turning back to Mr. Malenkov's statement,—what will destroy our Society? It is not a question in geometry or a question in dialectics, but in logic to draw a conclusion and to find the explanation for so much of what has been happening for Soviet policy and for so much that has been inspiring their moves in the past.

We are finding ourselves divided into two camps. It is a division which, until a little while ago, many people were inclined to attribute largely to the fact that there may be some means not yet exhausted to make the Soviet feel that we are all good fellows and that we should be working together. It is a curious thing that one American Ambassador after another went on special missions of friendship and goodwill to Moscow, returns to write his Memoirs—. There is one of them which is being published now by General Bedell Smith. They all seem to be a series of studies in frustration. Somehow the surprise which some of them have expressed in the failures of their missions is a surprise which I think they could have saved themselves if they would have, some time earlier, devoted a little time to studying the philosophy and the thoughts and what we often forget, the convictions, of the Communists themselves. In other words, it is not merely a matter of our smiling at them, to make them change their mind. The Soviets also have very definite ideas. They have very definite plans, and sometimes they work at them with an energy and persistence which is not always quite as intense on our side in the defence of that which they would like to destroy.

Just as a quarrel takes two people, so I am afraid that in friendship, it is not all a question of us giving, and their being willing to take it on our terms.

The battle is a little more complicated. In a way it is the most complicated one which we have had to face in political development through, I would almost venture to say, the centuries. In the rise to aggressive military power of a predecessor of Mr. Stalin, namely Mr. Hitler, we had a great number of similar ideas of the supremacy of the State expressed and proclaimed. They were studied and analyzed and put into text books, and driven into the heads of the young. The people who did not accept them were killed and politically exterminated. But there was one handicap which Mr. Hitler put upon himself at the beginning, which was one of the things which helped us a great deal. He injected that spurious and damnable race theory which, while causing so much suffering and destruction, also bore in it the very seeds of his own destruction. In order to spread his rule over the world he limited himself to the assistance and aid of those who were allegedly of the same race and blood and language. Consequently he gave up all possible chances of really spreading his teaching beyond the limits of only a certain people or group of people.

With Communism these limitations do not exist, and the weapons which they have employed have not been the weapons of modern warfare: they have used them only in the clearing-out process. It did not take Soviet divisions to kill the liberty and the freedom of the people of Czechoslovakia, or of Hungary, or of Roumania, or of Jugoslavia, or the Baltic States. It is true that some of the things were the immediate after-effects of the war, when the Red Armies were still pursuing the enemy, but I am taking into consideration the great and far more important military successes of the Soviets after the war. They were successes achieved once they had undermined the fibre of those whom they conquered. Their methods of military infiltration were not always the direct ones of proselytizing; very largely it was a matter of spreading economic defeatism, of undermining the faith and the hope and the belief of the people. So when they had destroyed the fibre, the morale, the spirit and the psychological fibre of the people, they could then enslave the body. The will to resist is their greatest enemy, and the will to resist can not be supplied by or substituted by planes and tanks, or even atom bombs.

In all our discussion of defence, there is one great danger, there is a lesson of history which is still so recent that it should not be forgotten—I am thinking of the mentality of the Maginot line, which France today can regret with good reason. France had her defences, she also had military strength, but the Communists had prepared the way for the Germans by sapping the strength and sapping the conviction, and also destroying the love of country in many Frenchmen. So when we look back at armament against armament, of France against Germany, results for France were not only sad but sudden. We must remember that, to use a definition that a very good friend of mine once used, the object of all war is in the final analysis to work your will upon the victim or the vanquished. And if you want to do that, you must first destroy his will to resist, and whether you do it through bombardment, or whether you do it through an insidious propaganda, the main thing must be remembered, and that is what you really set out to do.

And here I would like to touch on that one point which I consider at the present moment as most important. That is that in our defence, which needs must be military, and may be even far more military than it is today, the real strength lies in what we have to put up against the spurious siren's song which Moscow is able to sing, not in one tune of INTERNATIONALE but in many a tune. When we see that we had in the last few months, within those eighteen months since I was here last, such spectacles as the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, it is to the credit of all of us that the real purpose of it was so easily seen by the press of the world and by the people of all denominations. It was a challenge to a basic concept of the West of "rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and unto God what is God's"; and it was on that point that the battle was fought. It is the question of the supremacy of the State over all of the thinking and wishing, and all ambitions of individuals.

It is the question whether the individual is but a material being, a cog in the large totalitarian collectivism, or whether with his freedoms and liberties he could look to the State to help him to live his life as decided in the final analysis by individual conviction and conscience.

In this struggle, which is being aggravated today, which is coming closer and closer to Canada, that makes our own position even more and more important. Whether it is the Protestant pastors in Bulgaria, the persecutions in Hungary, or the persecutions which are now being started in China, it is difficult to bring in their relationship to Canada in the minds of many readers. This is because it is not always possible to get a direct example, tying up the particular politics say of Bulgaria with the free and happy life which we are leading here. But sometimes things fall into a very obvious pattern. The way the forces of totalitarianism are moving, whether they are moving West across Europe or East across Asia, they are approaching us on either side. When we look upon our position of privilege, when we look upon the vastness of our continent and the richness of our country we see why we are coveted. I cannot help, even in reading about the tremendous wealth which is being opened up in our Western provinces, in Alberta oil gushing at an ever-increasing rate and giving us promise of a greater and brighter future, of the expansion of our economic and social and political horizons I can not help feeling that in the very privileges we have there is a certain ominous reminder. Across the iron curtain and across the ice curtain, which is even closer to us, there are people who see in us a challenge to their very way of life, and who feel that even if their tanks and planes do not need to fly, one of their objectives which they must ensure is that this challenge of freedom and privilege does not remain too long.

There is no reason why men cannot travel freely through the Soviet Union, from the point of military intelligence. Why is it that your Correspondents have to stay in Moscow and get special permission before they can even leave the narrow limits to which they are confined? It is not because the Soviet Union, in all its vastness, is afraid of these men spying and telling things which might be dangerous. The reason to my mind is very simple: it is the same reason why the Voice of America is being stopped; it is the same reason why our books and publications can not come in freely. It is the fear that we will be seen by their people. If a slave of capitalist western countries, which is what a journalist working for publications on this side is called, should arrive fairly well fed, fairly well dressed, with such gadgets as a fountain pen and wrist watch and other things which have been much desired by those who came out of the Soviet Union during the time when Red armies over-ran parts of Europe, if those things are common amongst the people of the West, it might set their own people thinking!

It is the exclusion of knowledge of the West which is one of their great defences, and it is exclusion of knowledge or having friends amongst our own people, which is one of the greatest defence weapons utilized. We are in a vulnerable position today. We hold a position in which our greatest danger might not be whether Soviet Russia has the atom bomb or whether Soviet Russia has not. Any lessening on the part of our people to feel that what they have is great, or that that which they hold must be held at all costs, and that it is all anchored in our faith and our belief, because we are a part of a Christian civilization is our greatest danger. It has endowed us with privileges but also with obligations. It is worth defending; unless that is held very widely, the dangers of a "Maginot complex", which in itself is as materialistic as Communism itself, because it relies merely on the machine then we are in danger. Materialism disdains the individual not only by robbing him of his rights but by counting him merely as a functional unit. Unless we can throw against that philosophy, our conviction, we are in danger.—Many men not only in Soviet Russia but many men right here in this city are willing to lead lives of comparative poverty, with burning devotion to their cause making sacrifices which they make willingly to further Communism.—Unless we can throw against it the same conviction in our freedoms and liberties, I am afraid that the Maginot line of France is a story which might have parallels in future history.

Canada, between the iron curtain and the ice curtain, is today a country which is no longer able to look upon events as distant and as happening far away. We have become a border nation amongst the few remaining free ones. Whilst we stress the military and material privileges we hold, it is also in the realm of the spirit, in the realm of thought that we are attacked. If the very soul of man is attacked as Communism is attacking it, as Communism has attacked it in the person of Cardinal Mindzsenty, in the person of Archbishop Stepinac, in the trials in Bulgaria of Christian representatives of various denominations, if they are attacking the soul, let us learn from them. They realize that the values of the spirit of our own people are the things which are our greatest defence. When we read of events abroad today, let us think, it is that the first attack Communism makes is in the subversion of the young, the subversion of the schools, the suppression of religion. It is because they realize that that is where their greatest enemy lies, and that that by the same token, is our greatest strength.

"AN EXPERIMENT IN EDUCATION"

AN ADDRESS BY

REVEREND C. W. SOWBY, M.A.
PRINCIPAL, UPPER CANADA COLLEGE, TORONTO

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, November 17th, 1949

MR. COLEBROOK:

Honoured Guests—Members of the Upper Canada College Old Boys Association—Members of the Empire Club of Canada—it is not often our privilege in extending a welcome to our Guest Speaker that we can act in the dual capacity of extending to him also a very hearty and sincere welcome to our midst as a new Canadian.

It is, I think, most fitting that the Empire Club of Canada, founded for a single purpose and aim—that of strengthening the bonds of unity within the Empire—should be one of the first public bodies to extend this welcome to the Rev. Mr. Sowby.

You will have learned with interest from your notice cards of the distinguished career of our honoured guest and will have noted with pleasure, I am sure, that while he has temporarily sojourned in a country not notoriously friendly to the British Empire, that he was "Always keenly interested in the British Commonwealth and that Mr. Sowby welcomed the opportunity of bringing his family to Canada and living again under the British Flag."

As Canadians we rejoice in knowing that Upper Canada College has brought Mr. Sowby to assume the very important role of Principal of that Institution and I am sure I speak for all of you when I express the hope that his work may yield to him a full measure of happiness, success and satisfaction.

Mr. Sowby has chosen as the subject of his address today "An Experiment in Education".

MR. SOWBY:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:

It is a great honour to be asked to speak at the Empire Club. As an Englishman with an interest in history, and particularly in Empire development, as one who has lived in Southern Ireland 15 years, I have learnt to appreciate what this Club stands for: the greatest and most successful experiment in voluntary co-operation among free and equal nations that the world has ever known. I have had many friends in Ireland, England and in the Dominions who have a vision of what the Empire and Commonwealth means to the future of the world. One of my greatest friends was instrumental in helping to draw up the Statute of Westminster. For that reason among others I am delighted to be with you now, even as an Infant Canadian.

I appreciate the honour you have done me. I hope I shall convey to you my thoughts better than when I spoke further south on this continent two years ago. I was lecturing and in the front row a lady sat with eyes and mouth open, listening to me apparently with the greatest interest. This encouraged me greatly and when I had finished the Chairman asked for questions. The lady continued to gaze at me and said, "Gee, I love your English accent, you're just cute". I am afraid she had listened only to the accent!

I am grateful to the Secretary for the help he has given me. I feel now like the policeman outside Westminster Abbey early on the morning of the Coronation. A figure appeared outside the Abbey clad in gorgeous mediaeval robes and an old lady said, "Constable, who is that young man?" "That, ma'am", replied the policeman, "is His Grace the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshall of England. If this show goes well, he gets the credit, if it goes bad, I gets the blame".

When I asked for some advice as to what I should talk about, some of your members asked me to give you a bit of Irish Blarney and others to talk about my own subject—Education. Obviously I can't take up your time telling you funny stories about the land where the impossible always happens and the inevitable never does! Neither can I talk to you about education in Canada when I have been here less than three months. It would be most foolish of me to attempt it. So I propose to tell you about an educational experiment which has gone on in Ireland over the last 100 years. It is about the School over which I had the honour to preside as Warden of St. Columba's College.

I find that the title of Warden always causes some amusement on this continent. I notice a smile spreading over the faces of the audience. I now know that on this side of the world the title is reserved for the heads of institutions with higher walls and fewer holidays than a boy's school. Nevertheless, I must ask you to believe that I presided over a perfectly respectable boys' private school of the type that in Great Britain is quite logically called a *Public School.*

About 100 years ago in 1840, there was a young Oxford Don, William Sewell, a brilliant man, primarily a scholar, yet full of many interests. He was one of the progressive Tories whose conscience was shocked by the conditions of the poor in industrial England—conditions in the mines and factories, women and children working long hours and at impossible tasks. He joined heart and soul with Disraeli and Shaftesbury in trying to improve these conditions.

At Oxford he met many of the sons of the Irish Protestant landlords and was also shocked by their attitude towards their tenants, whom they regarded as scarcely human. But he met two conscientious men, Lord Adare and William Mansell, both Members of Parliament, who were anxious to improve the conditions of their country and particularly the appalling conditions of the Irish peasantry who were living in poverty and filth and with no hope of improvement. In Ireland there was none of the fierce loyalty which existed between the Scottish landlords and their clans, or the friendly relationship which usually obtained between the English squire and his people playing cricket on the village green. In Ireland, at that time, there was often bitterness or indifference; there was also the great barrier of religion and language, for the peasants spoke Irish and the landlords English. Sewell visited Ireland, saw the facts for himself and advised that Ireland needed a Public School in Ireland at which the future Irish Protestant landlords should be educated to be Irish and not imitation Englishmen, as they became by going to the English Schools. He was himself a Winchester boy and had long dreamed of an ideal Public School, a modern version of what Eton and Winchester were originally intended to be—a Christian Collegiate body composed of a number of cultured men living a common life like that of a University Common Room. His School was to be a Christian family where there should be courtesy, restraint, good humour and a common love of learning and teaching. The assistant masters were to take their part with the Headmaster, sharing his responsibilities, helping and advising him, so that with corporate responsibility they should speak with one voice. Education, he said, was not to be a means of making money, but a work of Christian duty and Christian love. They were to work with equal earnestness for all boys (not just for the most promising) and to form strict and accurate habits on all alike. Masters were also to be associated with the boys in their amusements as well as in their studies.

Sewell believed that a School should be a "family writ large"! that the discipline should be of a domestic or parental character, based not so much on fear of punishment as on mutual respect and consideration, gradually becoming self-discipline as boys matured, to be a blend of friendly informality with a certain dignity.

They decided that in order to found such a College, they must first find a really beautiful site. They chose a magnificent position on a richly wooded mountain, overlooking the sea. Here Sewell's imagination showed itself again. Believing in the almost forgotten Platonic theory that children should be surrounded by beauty, dignity and calm, they collected as many beautiful things as they could put into the School, beginning with some magnificent oak stalls for the chapel. These were very foolishly being thrown out by the Magdalen College, Oxford. He also obtained some very beautiful oak furniture, some of it of historic interest, for the house, 17th century tapestries, gold plate, including the flagon made for Charles Ist's wedding and the gold reliquary which belonged to St. Columba himself. Sewell consulted Arnold of Rugby, who agreed and said, "Sir, you cannot educate except under the shadow of antiquity." So they wisely imported the antiquity.

Only this week at Upper Canada, a small boy arrived at my house to call for a book which I had promised to lend to a master. He seemed to be interested in books and I showed him a book which was 250 years old and then he saw an old table. He said, "How old is this?" When I told him that it was 200 years old, he said, "My, sir, you have taken good care of it!"

The College was opened in 1843. For those days, the curriculum was positively revolutionary in its originality at a time when only the Classics were being studied in most other Public Schools. At St. Columba's, they remained the basis, but Mathematics were taught. Physical Science was taught, though it was thought that the laws of Chemistry might best be impressed on boys by being given to them to be turned into Latin Verse. Modern History was also taught and boys had a choice of French, Italian or German, Music and Art and Botany also were on the curriculum and at a time when in the English Schools the attitude towards games was one of disapproval or, at its best, indifference, Sewell insisted on his boys doing gymnastic exercises. We take all these things for granted now—but they were quite unheard of in those days. He was a great pioneer in education.

Over all this, the Irish language was compulsory for all scholars, in the hope of bridging one of the gaps between the Protestant landlords and clergy and the Irish-speaking peasantry. At the centre of it all was the Christian religion. By Collegiate body, they meant a community of practising Christians with God at the centre of every individual life and of the family life.

Those Founders a century ago also planned that eventually the College should compose its own music, draw its own building plans, build its own buildings, its own printing, run its own farm, in order to train men who would be independent, original and self-reliant. They saw the vision of a school which would be Irish and not a pale imitation of an English school; which would produce men who would have a feeling of responsibility to Ireland without being anti-English or anti anything else, men of wide interests and balanced judgment, capable of separating the good from the third rate, men whose ambition was to serve.

That was over a century ago! How did they succeed? Their College produced the leaders—an astonishing number of them in all walks of life, the Services (the College produced 16 generals in the last war alone although the country was officially neutral. As an Irishman in Dublin said, "Sure, we're neutral, we don't care who kills Hitler").

The College also produced many Indian Civil Servants, Colonial Servants, Judges, Doctors, leaders here in Canada—but practically none of them stayed in Ireland—and Ireland was much the poorer for it.

Now we move on 90 years, leaving aside the Home Rule period, the Irish Rebellion of 1916, the Treaty and the Irish Civil War. This is not the time or place to speak of them. I want to take up again the story of this Educational Experiment at the point at which I became an eye witness or participant. In 1934 times had changed. The Church of Ireland numbers had declined by 46% in less than 20 years, so that the Church of Ireland became only 5% of the population of South Ireland. The first reaction was an atmosphere of depression and defeatism. The survivors stood apart from the national life, lamenting a vanished past, waiting for a show of hostility from those newly in power. At any rate, they felt certain that there was no future for themselves or for their children in the new Ireland and that perhaps they had better send them to England. They were gradually reassured from time to time when the new Governments made it clear that they wanted the Southern Protestants to stay in the country, not as a disgruntled minority standing apart, but playing a useful part in the common life.

Times had changed in another respect. The broad and wise educational aims of the Founders had been to some extent forgotten. The current view of education was that it was a matter of training children to pass examinations at all costs, and that almost anything else was irrelevant. There is a true story about one very distinguished Irish Headmaster, the apostle of that school of thought (he was a great man and a great Head and I had a deep respect for him). For many years the Inspectors of the Irish Department of Education inspected his school, but each year they recommended to him that there should be a Library—each year he replied, "No, we work here, we have no time for reading!" At last, pressure was brought to bear by his Governors and once more the Inspectors presented themselves for their annual visit. "Now," he said grimly and grudgingly, "I've had to do it, come to see the Library". He showed them into a large room, empty except for a revolving bookcase housing the Encyclopaedia Britannica. With a magnificent gesture he said, "There, that's all we have time to read here!"

In 1934, St. Columba's felt that its original aims stood—to produce responsible men of wide and balanced education, capable of independent thought and also of serving the community—so the educational experiment was revived.

The Founders' idea was of a wide and balanced education with an opportunity for each boy to develop what is best in him, to develop his own character (we must never talk about moulding a boy's character—we have no right to mould anyone to our ideas of what he ought to be) and yet helping him to live happily in a community and to serve it.

To get real education, you must have a keen, vigorous and cheerful atmosphere, friendly relations and mutual trust between masters and boys. (The old idea of masters and boys being natural enemies is out-of-date). With the right leadership, the boys will be alive and keen—the discipline (for there must be discipline) will be something nearer to self-discipline and there will be a strong and vigorous community spirit and public opinion.

So, of course, we developed our clubs and societies, Art, Music, Dramatics, of course. The Natural History several years in succession was led by a prominent member of the Rugby team, watching birds and studying wild flowers and geology at weekends. debating and so on. Then, of course, there was manual work, carpentry, radio, engineering, printing, etc. to be fitted in. We were not a rich school, so we had to adapt our houses as club rooms, reroof them and put in new windows and doors—they were not professional jobs but the boys who did the work appreciated them all the more. These had to be made financially self-supporting.

The most popular community effort was half a mile or more of concrete road. The main avenue to the College was on the mountain side and became a mountain stream in wet weather. We borrowed a cement mixer and laid the cement. It took a year to do in short periods of an hour or two at a time, but it has stood the test of 10 years and still survives. It was hard work; but it taught us to enjoy working together in spite of blistered hands and stiff backs.

Then came the farm! This is an educational experiment, not just a method of producing food even though that was important, in view of the uncertainties during the war.

There is, I believe, a real danger that city dwellers are coming to regard the country merely as a place to picnic in and to look upon the farmer as a primitive or backward man who is content to spend his life in the mud because he hasn't got the intelligence to get out of it and into the city.

A civilization which believes that will perish and will deserve to perish. The warnings of Lord Boyd Orr ought to have taught us that. I believe that every child should learn to know something of Nature and the soil and the satisfaction of growing things and of caring for animals, of the dangers of soil erosion and of our duty of conserving it and of putting back into it what we have taken out; of the necessity of re-planting the forests and of not wasting God's natural gifts. We don't want to make them all into farmers, but we want them to appreciate the spiritual basis of the natural world. "Lord, how manifold are thy works, in wisdom hast Thou made them all, the earth is full of Thy riches".

So we worked our School farm of 110 acres. We had a dairy herd of twenty cows which provided our milk; we had our flock of sheep and killed our own mutton. We grew our oats and wheat, potatoes. We had our poultry and pigs, and Oh! those pigs! Many a morning I had to go down in my pyjamas and drive away the pigs which had escaped from their rightful quarters with their not inconsiderable families and rooted on my front lawns.

We had an agricultural graduate in charge of the farm. He had a farm committee, composed of himself, 8 boys and a workman. They met each week, kept minutes, reviewed the work of the past week and outlined the work for the next week. Then for two hours in the afternoon the farming boys worked in the fields hedging, ditching, feeding animals, sowing or picking potatoes. One day a week they had farm lectures by an expert. They also had a Young Farmers' Club—which visited other farms, had outside lecturers and films and an agricultural library in their club rooms, which they had made out of a ruined cottage.

Some boys took farming instead of games, some did some of each. All farmers did the full matriculation course, so that farming did not become a soft option.

During the last eight years, 16½% of the boys who left St. Columba's went into farming or veterinary work.

The Government became quite keen and gave all possible help—by giving handsome financial grants. They were keen to encourage the boys to stay on the land, in the hope that they would set an example of good farming in their own neighbourhoods and also take a more active part in the life of the countryside, which their fathers and grandfathers had left in order to join the British Services.

I hear someone (probably an Upper Canada father) muttering to himself—"with all those activities outside the curriculum, how do they get any School work done?" A very natural question and one I am glad to answer and I answer without hesitation. I have meditated for some time as to whether I should tell you this but perhaps I should give the results as they are the real justification of the experiment. During those years there was a steady rise in the standard of work in all cases. The number of university scholarships in all subjects grew steadily, and in the last two years boys from St. Columba's won the greatest number of scholarships at Trinity College Dublin of any School in Ireland. The numbers of boys obtaining First Honours in the University also rose steadily from 6 in 1938 to 29 in 1947 and 31 in 1948. They also had the largest number of any School on the Varsity Rugby Team, which shows a balance.

School Certificate or Matriculation results for the average boys improved steadily. In the last five years, four times all the candidates passed School Certificate with an average of 6 credits. Best of all, those boys who were below the average came into their own, while many of them flourished and their academic results surprised at times even the most optimistic members of the staff. Why? Because they were alive and active and developing in a balanced way. Of that I have no doubt at all. I should add that the standard of play in all games and track also improved. It is probably only a coincidence that our leading farmer of one year grew into the man who stroked the Cambridge University and also the English Olympic boat in 1948. Farmers have their uses!

During 16 years of being a headmaster, I have proved to my own satisfaction that if the education is balanced and the foundations are sound, the examination results will follow as a bi-product, which is all that they deserve to be.

We made our mistakes—plenty of them, but at any rate it was interesting and exhilarating work. I expect that similar things are being done here in different ways—some of it is being done much better. Probably the same ideas would not work out the same in detail here. Ideas and plans have to be adapted to different conditions.

Maybe Plato and his friends knew more about it all than we do and if they could come to speak to The Empire Club we might think them rather idealistic and impractical. I know what I think about it.

"SOME REMINISCENCES OF 1935-45"

An Address By

GENERAL H. D. G. CRERAR, C.H., C.B., D.S.O., A.D.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, November 24th, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen—in presenting to you Canada's most distinguished soldier I shall not make special reference to his well known war record in World War One and Two but recite briefly the great honours that have since been conferred on him by his own, and other, grateful countries in recognition of his outstanding military service. In June 1946 he represented Canada at the Victory Parade in London; receiving also at that time an Honorary Degree at Oxford (D.C.L.).

In October 1946 he was invited to visit Czechslovakia as a guest of the late President Benes.

In August 1947 on the invitation of General MacArthur he visited Japan; afterwards going to China and Hong Kong.

In September 1948 he was appointed special Canadian Ambassador to the Enthronement of Queen Juliana in Holland.

Also in 1948 he was signally honoured by being appointed A.D.C. General to His Majesty the King.

We are indeed proud and honoured to have as our Guest Speaker today a great Canadian who has in no small measure contributed to our country's status in the World today.

I have very great pleasure in presenting

GENERAL H. D. G. CRERAR, C.H., C.B., D.S.O., A.D.C. who will relate

SOME REMINISCENCES OF 1935-1945.

GENERAL CRERAR:

It was in April 1946, some three and a half years ago that I previously had the honour, and the responsibility, of addressing the members of The Empire Club. On that occasion, I spoke to you on the urgent need for adequate military preparation on the part of our country and, in that connection, emphasized the requirement of compulsory military training. As some of you may have noted, in the time since then, I have not ceased to express to other audiences the views I then put before you.

But, today, I shall not concentrate on one serious subject—instead I propose to recount a few personal experiences of the Second Great War which are, I think, of more than passing interest. And, while I am strongly of the opinion that professional government servants, on retirement, must be scrupulous in observing the confidences which have previously been entrusted to them by their political superiors, I believe that I can tell you a few tales of the period 1939-1945 without breach of faith. Inevitably, in stories such as these there is a pronounced personal note, but this, I trust, you will understand and excuse.

On 28th October, 1939, I arrived in the United Kingdom bearing several distinct and weighty responsibilities. My instructions were that I was to act as Military Advisor to the then Minister of Mines and Resources, the Honourable T. A. Crerar, who was to represent Canada at the "Dominion Ministers Conference" then assembling in London. I was also charged with the setting-up of a Canadian Military Headquarters in England and, in addition, was to undertake immediate arrangements with the War Office, for the reception, quartering, equipment and training of the 1st Canadian Division—due to cross the Atlantic some two months later. My staff, on arrival, consisted of one officer, then Lieut-Colonel, now Major-General E.L.M. Burns and one female stenographer. My accommodation was one small, artificially illuminated office in Canada House, not really large enough to hold the three of us at one time!

I am not going to go in to the difficult details of those earlier weeks in London, nor attempt to describe the many problems which had to be met, and solved. Instead, I will tell you of just one incident of interest, in that period, in which I was involved by reason of my particular responsibility as military advisor to my Minister, Mr. Crerar.

The First Lord of the Admiralty at that time, as you may remember, was the Honourable Winston Churchill. At a very early session of the Dominion Ministers' Conference, meeting under the Chairmanship of the British Prime Minister, the Honourable Neville Chamberlain, Mr. Churchill made it clear that the Admiralty, in view of the increasing number of German submarines in the North Atlantic, was reluctant to assume the very heavy responsibility of the safe escort to United Kingdom ports of the large convoy required for the 1st Canadian Division. It was, consequently, the view of the Naval Staff that instead of the Canadians coming to England, they should sail direct to French ports in the Bay of Biscay and, taking over French barracks in the Loire area, carry out in France, *not* in the U.K., their further training, equipment and general preparation for active operations.

My Minister, no less than myself, was very opposed to this proposal by the Admiralty. Certainly from the Canadian point of view there were strong objections to it. The rate of equipment, and also training arrangements, for the Canadian troops were bound to suffer greatly. The administration problem would be much magnified. And there were obvious disadvantages to all ranks of the Canadians in the matter of their welfare services and leave during the months of preparation for action which, inevitably, lay ahead. It was consequently, arranged that my Minister, accompanied by our High Commissioner, the Honourable Vincent Massey and myself, should have a special, and separate, conference with Mr. Churchill, at which we might have an opportunity to persuade him to change the conclusions which he had previously so strongly put forward.

We met late the following afternoon at the Admiralty—Mr. Churchill, his Naval Secretary and the three Canadians grouped around the octagonal table in the First Lord's room—a well known bit of Admiralty furniture.

My Minister opened the discussion and then "passed the ball" to me. For the next fifteen minutes or so I then argued the Canadian case, to the best of my ability, with a man who is a very formidable person, indeed, to argue with. Finally, however, Mr. Churchill, leaning back from the table, said, "Well, I think Brigadier Crerar is right. We'll organize a whopping big escort and the Navy will bring the 1st Canadian Division safely to the United Kingdom."

You can imagine that we three Canadians were pretty pleased at this solution. Indeed, I felt rather particularly pleased with myself. But my self-gratification was somewhat deflated when Mr. Churchill, then turning to my Minister said, "Well, Crerar and Massey, I think the time and occasion calls for a drink and a cigar" and, leaving me with his Naval Secretary at the Conference table, led the other two Canadians to a buffet where the indicated hospitality was produced! I felt then—and I still do—that if anyone needed, or deserved, a drink at that time it was I, and, in the circumstances, that I was somewhat unkindly treated!

It is, of course, a major responsibility of a Senior Commander, in war, to think and plan as far ahead as it is rational and possible to do so. In my experience there was no such officer in the Allied Armies who fulfilled this responsibility more ably than did Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery of Alamein. He gave tremendous thought to future contingencies and did so with great thoroughness. His resulting appreciations of what the enemy would do, and what he would do to the enemy were, therefore, models of clarity and brevity.

But no Senior Commander does his thinking unassisted. He obtains the very best information that he can, from others best qualified to help him, before he weighs the "pros and cons" of the issue and decides to adopt a certain technique and plan. I am now going to describe, briefly, a couple of occasions when the thinking carried out at Headquarters, 1st Canadian Corps and, later, at Headquarters First Canadian Army were of important assistance to operations subsequently planned and ordered at the higher levels of Allied and Army Group Headquarters.

My first reference is to the "savage clash" at Dieppe in August, 1942—though it is my intention to speak on the subsequent, and vastly important, results of that day of bitter fighting and not on the desperate, gallant episodes with which it was filled.

The fundamental requirement for success in that planned raid on Dieppe was tactical surprise. Indeed, as the means of obtaining heavy supporting fire when closing the beaches were not then available, nor even invented, tactical surprise was the only possible basis on which mainly to depend. In the result, surprise was in no way obtained and the rest of that day's story all the world knows.

The outstanding lesson of Dieppe, therefore, was the absolute need of the development of new and special means to secure overwhelming fire support as the landing craft closed on the enemy coast line. Not otherwise would it be reasonable to assume the feasibility of getting assaulting forces on to the beach and through strong enemy beach defences.

It was nearly a year, following Dieppe, before these specialized weapons and equipments commenced to become available and, in consequence, it was not until July, 1943, that the 1st Canadian Corps was given the responsibility of evolving, and demonstrating, with the necessary Naval and Air components, the tactics and techniques which, in the light of the tragic lessons of Dieppe, would give convincing promise of success in any future, large-scale, combined operation against a strongly defended enemy coast-line.

The 3rd Canadian Division was the formation selected by me to demonstrate the principles and procedures which I believed essential to pursue in order to solve this most difficult military problem. These principles were hammered out to something approaching finality in a 1st Canadian Corps Study, held from 26th to 31st July, 1943. In brief, the object of the study, as I laid it down, was to produce the simplest and most assured plan of fire and movement in closing the beaches, accepting as a primary principle that what the fire, or movement, lacked in exactitude required to be compensated for in volume and in speed. In the following weeks the 3rd Canadian Division with its allotted Naval and Air Forces, evolved a mutually satisfactory operation of procedure and technique which was effectively demonstrated to a very important gathering in a combined Exercise known as "Pirate" which took place in Studland Bay, off the Isle of Wight, in October, 1943.

A few days later I left for Italy with the leading elements of the 1st Canadian Corps. I took with me copies of the 1st Canadian Corps papers dealing with this evolution of the tactics and techniques of the assault landing, as demonstrated at Studland Bay. On 13th November, 1943, I gave them to General Montgomery, then Commanding the Eighth Army in Italy, for his study. They came back to me, by hand of his Chief of Staff, Major General de Guingand, some six weeks later, with the comment that the ideas and procedures developed by 3rd Canadian Division, and demonstrated at Exercise "Pirate", agreed with views held at Eighth Army Headquarters. Six months later, in the landing of the Allied Forces on the Normandy Beaches, the basic plan, the methods and techniques, bought and paid for by the 2nd Canadian Division at Dieppe, and demonstrated, over a year later, by the 3rd Canadian Division at Studland Bay, were put into successful execution. In my opinion, therefore, the preliminary contribution made by Canada to that immense and vital operation of war, which took place on 6th June, 1944, cannot be over-estimated, and I consider that, as Canadians, we are entitled to bear that thought quietly in mind.

A further matter I propose to tell you about has reference to a remark by Major General de Guingand, Field Marshall Montgomery's former Chief of Staff, which is recorded in de Guingand's recently published book entitled "Operation Victory". In it he writes, when describing certain of the important incidents prior to "D" day—

> "We gave the Canadian Army the particular task of studying the operation for crossing the Seine. They produced some excellent material which proved of immense value when the time came."

I will not go into the Appreciation and Outline Plan which, with the very great assistance of my Staff I had prepared—the stated object being the crossing of the river Seine and the capture of Rouen and Le Havre—except to confirm that the future situation confronting the Allied Armies, as pre-conceived in that Appreciation and the proposed Plan of Operations to deal with it, did in fact, prove to be very closely in accordance with what actually later took place. So, as de Guingand wrote, the Canadian Army material *did* prove "of immense value".

However, I have strong reasons, to believe that certain additional observations by Headquarters, First Canadian Army, which went to Field Marshall Montgomery's Headquarters at the same time as the Appreciation just referred to—12th April, 1944—emphasizing the probability of heavy German attacks developing against the Caen sector shortly after the Allied landing, were also of value. At all events, in the subsequent development of 21 Army Group plans, the dispositions following the landing made effective preparations for the severe German pressure which, in fact, developed against the "Caen hinge" in the earlier weeks of the invasion and, indeed, Field Marshall Montgomery exploited this situation in a manner which, in August, two months after the landing, brought the enemy a decisive defeat. I suggest, therefore, that also in this very important matter the Canadian Command and Staff made a further noteworthy "pre-invasion" contribution to Allied success under Field Marshall Montgomery's direction.

My concluding reminiscences today are in a lighter vein and I shall but touch on two of them.

On the 29th August, 1944, after several days of very heavy fighting with strong and stubborn German forces, the 3rd Canadian Division succeeded in forcing the crossing of the River Seine and entering the great and historic French city of Rouen. In spite of the very heavy bombing the Allied Air Forces had done to that portion of the city lying in the vicinity of the all-important river bridges, the townspeople gave the Canadian troops a tremendous and moving welcome on their arrival.

As this was the first of the large cities of France to be freed from the enemy by the Canadian Army it was decided that something special should be done about it. On the 12th September, therefore, I flew back to Rouen from my Tactical Headquarters—by then establishing near St. Omer, and a hundred miles further on—to present to the Mayor and Municipality, with due formality, and amidst scenes of civic enthusiasm and emotion, a commemorative plaque which had been skilfully and tastefully prepared by a craftsman of the Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps.

Now, it was my custom each evening, to dictate to my Confidential Clerk a record of important correspondence and activities of that day for inclusion in my personal War Diary. That evening was no exception and the ceremonial at Rouen was duly, and briefly, noted.

It was not until the end of the war, however, that one of the Official Historians of the Army, in a personal letter to me drew to my attention a spelling error in that day's War Diary. In the result, it is recorded that on that date I had returned to Rouen and, on behalf of the Canadian Army, presented the city with a "plague"!

As a preliminary to the second story I shall tell I must explain that in the 1st Canadian Corps, and later in the

Canadian Army as a whole, particular attention was paid to convincing all ranks of the military truth that to look, and act, "tough" was just the reverse of an indication that the individual would prove a "tough" fighter in battle. Many centuries of military experience have, indeed, proved the reverse and that, as a general rule, it is the man who shows himself a smart, self-respecting soldier on or off duty who proves himself, in action, a first class fighting man.

As an indication that a good selling job in this matter had been done to the Canadian troops during their long and difficult period of training, and re-training, in the United Kingdom, I was able to pass on to all ranks, 1st Canadian Corps, in February, 1943, a remark made to me by the Commander in Chief Home Forces when I had been with him on a visit to the Eighth Army in Africa. General Paget had then said to me that he could always recognize Canadian troops, when off duty and at a distance by their excellent bearing and turn-out. He had added that their individual saluting, when met, seemed so spontaneous and friendly it was always a great pleasure to return the compliment.

Well, a few weeks later I was in London one Sunday afternoon. The street I was walking down was deserted—as usual in that city on that day and at that time—when, suddenly, around the next corner hove into view six soldiers, three Canadians and three Americans, arm-in-arm, in pairs and obviously "celebrating". It was a somewhat embarrassing prospect I had to face—but there was no alternative but to go forward and meet it.

As I approached the cheerful and somewhat unsteady, sextet my presence just couldn't help being noticed. There was some remark made by the leading Canadian and, in an instant, the Canadian soldiers disentangled themselves from their American friends, much to the latters' physical confusion, and marched by me giving me really a "super" salute which I tried to return as if nothing unusual was apparent. A second or so later I passed the three American soldiers who had been so abruptly deprived of the mutual support of their Canadian friends and consequently had been left in what might be termed "a bit of huddle." It was really very hard not to laugh at their confusion and the surprised look on their faces. I maintained outward composure but, inwardly, I chuckled delightedly, at the way our fellows had "shown their stuff" in spite of their personal distractions of that moment. And, as I walked away, I thought that General Paget had certainly had the soundest of grounds for his previous congratulatory remarks.

Well, gentlemen, if I reminisce any longer I shall certainly exceed my time, so I shall thank you for listening to me—and sit down.

"A MID-CENTURY LOOK FORWARD AND BACKWARD"

An Address By

RONALD A. McEACHERN, B.A., Ph.D.,
Editor, The Financial Post, Toronto, Ont.

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, December 1st, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

It is our pleasure to have with us today a keen observer of events and happenings who is going to invite us to take a look forward and backward from our present mid-century position.

Your Notices have given you details of our guest's background, which I shall not repeat, except to make brief reference to two important phases of his work; which are his weekly editorial "The Nation's Business" on the front page of the Financial Post—which I expect most of you read with interest—and his popular book recently published "Putting Your Dollars to Work", which I trust has been profitably studied by many of you.

I understand he applies that system very successfully to his golf game with special emphasis on "Your Dollar". I have much pleasure in introducing Mr. Ronald A. McEachern who will address us on his chosen subject.

Mr. McEachern:

I am not going to confine my remarks solely to what seem to be the prospects for business next year.

We now stand at the midpoint of our century. I think it is important at this time therefore that we should take a look at ourselves and at our society; try to assess the failures and accomplishments of the past 50 years; try to assess the probabilities of the next 50.

Only if we truly comprehend the years behind us can we walk with wisdom into the future.

In the laboratories, scientists can give guinea pigs nervous breakdowns by giving them a series of surprises, disappointments, frights and frustrations.

For us as human beings, the past half century has been very much like those labs have been to the guinea pigs.

For never in the history of the human race has any one generation been subjected to such a series of momentous shocks and changes.

In the realm of human tragedy and economic earthquake, we have had the two greatest wars in man's history. Though we call our age civilized, there has been more torture, more cruelty, more mass morder in the past 10 years in Nazi and Russian prisons than in all the previous record of human society put together.

In the realm of science, our brief half century has brought the universal application of electric power, the internal combustion engine, the motor car, the airplane, radio and television. Every one of those has had a most profound effect on our way of life and on the economic life of our civilization.

Now we have learned something about the management of the atom and harnessing the power in nuclear fission. In the half century ahead it is virtually certain that atom power will be in use for peaceful purposes. We shall be in for another major revolution in our technological, economic and social structure.

Mere words are hardly adequate to emphasize the simply enormous effect which these developments have had and will have on our business lives, our personal lives and on our social organization.

In medicine, the past decade and even the past few months have seen greater accomplishment in new and fundamental ways of keeping man healthy and in prolonging his life than in all the previous history of mankind.

The sulfa drug and penicillin opened up vast new fields for conquest over disease. A more sensational aspect of those discoveries was that here, almost for the first time, medical men were able to cure disease, not merely treat it, leaving time and nature to do the job. The new drugs put out disease like water on fire. Before that, apart from surgery, medical men could merely build firebreaks, help let the fire burn out.

Just announced a few months ago are the new things ACTH and cortisone which, according to medical scientists, are the most sensational developments yet in the cure and treatment of disease. Here science has got on to something far more important than all the other drugs and herbs, serums and chemicals in the whole pharmacopœia.

It isn't just what cortisone has already proven itself able to do for things like arthritis. The really important thing about it is that it opens up wide new approaches for the fight against troubles of the heart and the arteries, and the whole mysterious business of why we grow old and die; why the body progressively loses its power to restore tired tissue and to keep organs functioning efficiently.

To medical scientists, cortisone is just as exciting in its possibilities as atomic power is to the physical scientist. The supply is still short, but one of Canada's outstanding researchers last week said "It's short now but a few years hence we'll have nothing to worry about."

The importance of this medical revolution of the past decade or two is not just what it has done and will do in preventing human suffering and in extending the life of certain individuals.

The social, economic and political results of having a much, much larger part of our population old and vigorous will, in the decades immediately ahead, call for important changes of many kinds—not least of which will be in our business practices regarding compulsory retirement, our pension and insurance plans. Caring for the aged will become an immense problem. When enough time has elapsed for this recent medical revolution to have its full impact on a whole generation, the effect on our institutions, on our ideas as to how to run a country, will be terrific.

But if, during the past half century, the developments in science and technology have been enormous, they have been no less revolutionary in the realm of ideas.

The great depression and the second great war have had an enormous influence on man's beliefs about his environment and on how society should be organized.

Now firmly fixed in the minds of the overwhelming number of voters is the idea that government must support the jobless, must provide something called full employment, that family incomes should be levelled, that it is right and proper to take money away from you to let him spend more. Here is another explosive idea which has gained popular acceptance only in recent decades.

The fact is that Canada and the United States, Britain and most other countries now have the welfare or handout state. We all have it, only the degree varies. Because the handout state is popular where the most votes are, we're going to have more of it regardless of the consequences.

Sumner Slichter of Harvard, today's most eminent philosopher and interpreter of business, very well summarized how the past 50 years have revolutionized the climate in which businessmen operate.

Three things have happened, he says:

One is the transformation of the economy from one of free private enterprise to one of government-directed enterprise.

Second, is the rise of the welfare—or call it the handout state.

Third is the relative shift in power from business management to employees.

Now, we may or may not deplore these developments. We may or may not be fearful of where they lead.

But we can't deny that these very profound changes have taken place.

But fundamental as those developments are, revolutionary as the shift in power within the community has been, perhaps the most important new idea to emerge from the past half century is this:

It is the idea and the reality of an expanding universe, the actuality that the world can be a better, more abundant place for vast masses of people.

Up to the beginning of this century—yes and even up to very recent decades—men's ideas as to what was sound and proper policy for the conduct of business, government and their personal affairs were based on ideas which had evolved from the experience of the centuries before and which found expression in the nineteenth century philosophers like John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham, and so on.

The fundamental concept was that nature was niggardly; that our world would be rapidly running out of raw materials like coal and iron; that because world population was increasing, there would be increasing hunger and a constant pressure downward on living standards.

In such a world, increasing misery for the masses was, so everybody believed, inevitable. No wonder then that those of superior energy and ability so often adopted the policy of "Me for myself and the devil take the hindmost".

It was on that theory of the inevitability of the increasing misery of the masses that Communist and to some extent Socialist doctrine was based.

What the people of the nineteenth century couldn't foresee, and what exploded the increasing misery idea, were the simply fantastic developments of science in the past two or three decades.

These developments, of which more great ones are now on the way, have compelled us to revolutionize our attitude toward our world, our thinking as to what is wise law, our practices as to what is the sound way to run a business.

Adjusting ourselves to this new world is going to be the main job for the second half of this century.

What do I mean by an expanding universe?

It is true that we are using up at an increasing rate the world's irreplaceable resources of things like iron and petroleum. But the skill of the geologists and physicists at finding these hidden treasures has pretty well kept up with our increased use.

Right now, if we really had to, we could adjust ourselves to a world in which we had neither iron nor petroleum.

At the moment, the main reason we are using iron and petroleum is not that they are indispensible, but that compared with alternatives we find their properties and, above all, their prices preferable.

And what about food. Our fathers and grandfathers were sincerely convinced that, as world frontiers were pushed back and as world population went on growing, increasing hunger would be the world's fate.

But remember that agricultural methods only 100 years ago were virtually the same as they were 3,000 years ago. Remember that the past 30 years pretty well spans the entire modern revolution in agriculture—gasoline power machinery, highly developed crop rotation, plant breeding, control and prevention of plant disease, and above all, chemical fertilizer.

The changes in our food picture are just astounding. Predictions that this will be a hungry planet have been completely exploded.

Then, of course, our newly expanding universe offers a staggering array of great developments and even greater promise in the fields of chemistry and power production.

Equally important in creating a better world for more people is another invention of comparatively recent date. Its period of widespread growth is confined almost to our own generation—that is the business corporation, which permits large size, full exploitation of machinery and research, and which commands access to large amounts of capital.

Some people talk about "soulless corporations". To some, bigness is in itself a crime.

That is nonsense. Only bigness has made it possible to spend the enormous amounts on research and on product development which in recent decades have changed our lives, and put armies of men to work at jobs which never before existed. Think of aviation, refrigeration, nylon, plastics, the thousands of products now coming from petroleum, electronics, aluminum, to mention only a very few.

Only bigness has made it possible so to increase mechanization that worker productivity has soared. Only bigness has made possible the stupendous achievement of filling our roads with cars, our homes with refrigerators and radios, putting nylon on our women, and silicone centres in our golf balls.

Another important fact is that with size goes responsibility. The little firm has only its own modest local reputation to care for or to lose. It can fire and lay off employees with only very slight impact on the community. Not so the big corporation.

Actually, the practices and the motivations in a corporation will often be a good deal better for the employee and the community as a whole than the practices and motivations in the owner-run business.

If I have my own business I can quite conceivably reach a state where I say I'm quite satisfied with the product, the volume, the net profit. Being a human animal, I shall, over the years, slow down in my efforts, content myself with lower targets. I may say I prefer to get more golf and take less profit.

But the corporation executive can very seldom take such a comfortable course. First, the corporation is run by hired hands, employees whose interests are almost precisely the same as those of the mechanics and elevator operators. Their assignment is to make the corporation grow and to maintain it in constant health. They are just incidents in the life of the corporation which, unlike man, need never die.

So—the greater the size, the greater the responsibility which the community forces upon the business organization—on its dealings with customers, with its suppliers, with its employees.

On this factor of responsibility I'm reminded of one businessman talking about his income tax. He said "When there was just myself and when my wife looked after the books, things were dandy. Then I hired a bookkeeper, and as the business grew, I had to hire another and another and all the time I had to get more honest about my income tax".

That's just one aspect of the truth that with increased size goes increased responsibility.

Charles Luckman, the dynamic head of the great Lever organization, vividly expressed in a tangible way this new concept of an expanding, bountiful universe when he said:

"This may surprise those of us who believe that simply because we have the highest standard of living in the world we have everything we need. (But) . . . . 27 million Americans have no kitchen sinks, 18 million Americans lack washing machines, 25 million Americans lack vacuum cleaners, 1 million Americans need new homes this year, 40 million Americans have neither bath-tub nor shower. So let's not talk about what we've got . . . . because these needs provide dramatic illustration of the fact that we haven't finished anything—we're only beginning."

In recent months two major investigations of what our world will look like in the decades immediately ahead have been made by two of the most distinguished business philosophers of our time. One is the celebrated Slichter of Harvard, already referred to. The other is Moulton of the famed Brookings Institution. Both stake their great reputations on a future that is infinitely richer than the present.

Their yardsticks of growth can be applied to Canada with reasonable accuracy.

The Harvard prediction is for 1980—only 30 years hence.

Population will be up over 20%.

The number of people at work—earning money—will be up almost 21%.

Output per man hour will be up 88%.

As incomes go up, the demand for leisure has always increased. In 1900, the average work week was 58 hours. By 1929 it was 48 hours. By 1940 it was 40 hours. The Harvard forecast is that by 1980, the 30 hour week will be almost universal in business and industry.

And here is the important figure:

National income in terms of today's prices will be up almost 69%.

Is this forecast just optimistic hokum? There are yards of evidence to suggest that it is not—provided we do not go crazy and get our affairs bewitched with socialist or communist governments, and provided we run our affairs with at least as much sense as in the past.

The Harvard man says:

"Suppose someone in the year 1900 had predicted that within 50 years the amount of goods consumed per person would have risen two and a half times, that nearly four out of five children of high school age would be in high school; that the number of university students would increase four times as fast as the population; that nearly every family would own an automobile, a telephone, a wireless receiving set; and that this would be accomplished after paying the cost of two great wars and while we were gradually reducing the work week from 58 hours to 40." The forecast, says Slichter, would have been quite accurate, but anyone making such bold predictions would have been regarded as irresponsible.

You will recognize immediately what all this portends for future business.

Certainly it means high taxes and high wages.

But here's a point too often overlooked.

You can't do much business with people who can't afford shoes.

Years ago old Henry Ford startled everybody when he said: "I pay big wages so my men can buy my cars."

The measure of our national health and wealth, the size of your market, is directly linked with the amount of money the masses of our land are able to spend.

All right. Now we are facing a new half century.

What's our contribution going to be in getting it off on the right foot?

First, I think it's going to be in getting a clear picture of where we stand now; a realistic appraisal of the actualities of our economic position, the actualities of public opinion.

The mastodon and the brontosauri of pre-historic times disappeared from the face of the earth because they could not or did not adjust themselves to their changing environment. There have been many changes we may or may not like. Many trends of the past 50 years may or may not alarm us. But we can ignore them only at our peril.

The second contribution we have to make at this point in our history is what I call, for want of a better name, public education.

All of us here are sorrowfully familiar with the extraordinary lack of public understanding there is about the simplest workings of our business system.

Here in our own beloved country which we regard as one of the most highly educated in the world, we have hundreds of thousands who associate bigness in business with badness.

Actually, bigness has made business more competitive. Chain stores and mail-order houses have made all retailing more competitive.

Bigness has increased rather than lessened competition by its ability to mechanize, to pay for research and to create new products and new uses for old products, to make jobs where jobs never before existed.

Another fallacy of our time, widespread, rampant in the pulpit and schoolroom particularly is that profit is a bad thing.

If the men of business don't help promote an understanding of how the business system operates, who will? Where there are no profits, there soon won't be any jobs. Without labor, there are no good things to consume or to possess. Without labor, there is no wealth to share.

There is no magic pool of wealth from which government can pay anything to anybody.

And one point let me emphasize.

Let's choke off some of these free enterprise speeches that we've been getting in recent years.

Some of its would-be defenders make free enterprise sound like something that even I wouldn't want.

The great thing about our business system is its capacity for change. The Communist system was set down in 1848 and has changed hardly at all since. The Socialist system advocated for Canada was set down in England in the late years of the last century and it has changed even less than Communism. The Socialists haven't done any real thinking in half a century.

But look at the enormous changes which have taken place in our business system. Let's make it very clear that what we want to keep and to improve is not the business system of 1900 but the business system of today and make it better serve the needs of tomorrow.

What about the year immediately ahead?

Ancient kings used to chop the heads off messengers who brought news they didn't like. Some people want to kick the telephone messenger. I hope that will not happen on this occasion.

As you are very well aware, business in Canada is profoundly affected by what happens in the United States and in Britain.

Britain is still a long, long way from getting out of her troubles. Unless British policy undergoes drastic revision, signs are already beginning to accumulate indicating the serious likelihood of still another British financial crisis, with yet another devaluation move. Canada's exports to countries other than to the United States are already showing definite decline.

To make any forecast for Canada one must therefore make some estimation first of what is likely to happen elsewhere.

Here, then, are some comments about the Canadian outlook based on what can now be known about facts and about trends.

Canada's gross national production which this year is around $16 billions, looks as if for next year it may be $14½ to $14¾ billions.

Investment—or let us call it expenditures on houses, plants and buildings of all kinds, equipment and so forth—is one of the key factors in the business outlook. 1949 gave Canada about the biggest investment boom in our history. For next year, it will be lower, but not apparently very much. There won't be as much investment in industrial and commercial plant and equipment. There will be fewer new houses built. But the utilities and various governments have very large building programs for next year, so the investment picture overall looks very good.

There will be rather less employment next year. This is a figure about which there is much popular confusion and some hysteria. You will probably see unemployment reaching a seasonal peak of 300,000 or about 6% of the working force. But to keep that picture in perspective remember that in recent years we have had actually a condition of more than full employment.

In other words, a substantial portion of the people who will at some time be listed as unemployed will be wives and boys and girls who have been working and adding to family income, but whose earnings are not essential to family welfare.

Remember I have said that might be a figure for the seasonal peak which is quite a different thing from saying that so many families are going to go without a job all year or even half of it.

Wages are going to be rather higher. What the unions are going to ask for I don't know, but their aim is to get an extra 10 cents an hour made up of higher wage rates and or pension and other benefits.

A general rise in union wage scales almost inevitably leads to some general rise.

A good many prices, on the other hand, by the end of 1950 will be lower though there may be some further increase in the cost of living meanwhile. Foods are one group of commodities where declines are indicated. Clothing is another. Price shaving in a good many consumer durables seems certain.

Incidentally, I think 1950 is likely to see the start of a good deal of commotion in the whole textile field. It will be at its worst in the United States, but we won't escape its effects here. Because of artificial props under both raw wool and cotton, both those prices are high and are likely to remain high. But just recently the synthetic fibre people have cut prices about 15%. More important is the fact that by next year a lot of research into synthetic fibres, their treatment and their manufacture into finished goods and fabrics, is going into the pay-off stage. During the year you will be seeing synthetic fibres turning up in many novel places—and in very much more satisfactory form than hitherto.

For many branches of business and industry, 1950 will be a year of lower earnings and profits.

It is probable that 1950 will produce some distress areas, both in certain sections of industry and in certain sections of the country. If so, we can expect to see direct intervention by the government attempting to do something about it.

What all this means to the advertising and sales industries will be obvious enough. It means more, harder and better work. Sales machines which haven't had a really good work-out in ten years are in for some excitement. The newer generation which has come into the industry will be in for some real eye-openers.

A lot of people are going to have their first experience in a long time with free, competitive enterprise.

Now let's get this perfectly straight.

There is every indication that 1950 is going to be a year of good business for most people. It will be a much busier year than any we had during the war years or before the war, or in that so-called bonanza year of 1929.

What I predict is that 1950 will be a good year.

It just won't be as good as the fabulously good 1949 and 1948.

Before sitting down, there is one point I wish to emphasize.

Necessarily, any business weather forecast must be in general terms. It can examine only what will happen to man in the mass.

But what you and I want to know most of all is what happens to us.

That to some degree will depend on the capacity of the managers of the company for which we work. As competition gets harder, as margins grow thinner, the less energetic, the less capable obviously find the going harder.

How are we looking after our physical, mental and emotional health? Are we keeping the right perspective on our job, and on ourselves? Everyday men are missing promotions or being guest of honor at office farewell parties because they didn't learn to use their heads, to develop good work habits, to become dependable members of a working team—all of which usually means that their mental and emotional health has been undermined.

Learning how to make constructive and absorbing use of leisure is an urgent and increasing problem for hundreds of thousands of Canadians not just in the shops and plants, but in the administrative offices. I raise a delicate matter, and one which it is perhaps impolite to mention, but everywhere we are seeing the unfortunate evidences of the fact that too much boredom and too much alcohol don't make a desirable weekend.

In the final analysis what 1950 means to you and to me depends on nobody but ourselves.

"WESTERN OIL FLOWS EASTWARD"

An Address By

DR. OLIVER B. HOPKINS, B.A., Ph.D.
Vice-President, Imperial Oil Limited

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, December 8th, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen: No more fascinating story has been unfolded in the development of Canada's resources than the geological surveys of the Western Provinces and North West Territories, leading to the great oil discoveries in the past twenty years.

Our honoured guest's contribution to that remarkable development has been outstanding.

Having received his degree from the John Hopkins University he was immediately appointed Assistant State Geologist of Georgia and from 1914—1919 was a member of the United States Geological Survey. In 1919 he came to Canada, joining the Imperial Oil Limited, commencing exploratory operations in the West and was in charge of a geological party operating from the Athabaska to the Peace River.

In 1920 he went to Colombia, South America, to evaluate the property of the Tropical Oil Company, which was subsequently absorbed by the International Petroleum Company.

On his return to Canada in 1921 he was appointed Chief Geologist of both International Petroleum Company and Imperial Oil Limited. In 1933 he became a Director of the International. In 1944 he was appointed a Vice-President and in 1945 was elected to the Board of Directors of Imperial Oil Limited.

To Dr. Hopkins and his Department goes the credit for the discovery and development of Canada's first major oil field in over a decade—the new Leduc Field near Edmonton, Alberta.

He has made many contributions to geological literature with several books and articles to his credit.

I have very much pleasure on calling upon Dr. Hopkins now who will address you on his chosen subject—

"WESTERN OIL FLOWS EASTWARD".

DR. HOPKINS:

Not long ago a friend of ours from Texas made his first visit to Toronto. One of the things which impressed him most was the hotel in which we are meeting—and in particular the Imperial Room. He explained "We think we do things in a pretty big way in our state, but we've never managed to persuade our largest hotel to name its main dining room after our company." I am sure he would be even more impressed if he were here today and realized that such a representative group of business and professional men had been formed to foster and extend Imperial relationships.

Although those relationships are not the subject of what I am to talk about today, I deeply appreciate your invitation to speak to you. It is, in itself, an indication of the far-reaching importance of the oil development in western Canada.

Exactly three years ago today a drilling rig at a wildcat well not far from Leduc, a prosperous little town in the midst of a fertile agricultural area of central Alberta, had reached a depth of 2,400 feet. Perhaps the drillers on that rig could be excused if their attitude was one of hopeful resignation. This was just another test well that appeared to hold no more promise than some of its unsuccessful predecessors.

For Imperial Oil, Leduc was the 134th wildcat drilled in western Canada over a period of almost 30 years—and there was as yet little to show as a result.

Other companies were no more fortunate.

This gloomy picture of only three years ago was superimposed on a background no less discouraging. On the prairies, production from existing fields was declining and there seemed little hope of relief from the heavy transportation cost of bringing crude from distant United States fields. Nationally, Canada was importing over 90 per cent of her oil requirements—and paying for it in U.S. dollars which, even then, were hard to find.

That was three years ago. Today, by developing known fields, Canada could produce about one-half of all the oil she uses and we talk in terms of possible self-sufficiency within a few years.

The turning point came on February 13, 1947, when the Leduc well I mentioned a moment ago blew in as a successful producer. In the light of subsequent developments, little wonder it was acclaimed the most important oil discovery in North America that year, and has been referred to as a landmark in Canada's economic history.

The importance of Leduc was not only that it was the discovery well in a field which contains some 240 million barrels of oil, but even more in the fact that it opened up new hunting grounds for the oil prospector and made western Canada one of the most active oil exploration areas in the world.

In earlier years, exploration in Alberta had been concentrated largely in the foothills and in the southern plains. Logically so, because Turner Valley, the one major field, was found in the foothills. And in the south there had been just enough small showings of oil to encourage further exploration. Some oil had been discovered in the eastern part of the province, at the Saskatchewan border, but it was heavy crude and not suitable for the manufacture of the light fuels required.

Leduc, as you know, is in the central section of Alberta near Edmonton, and oil occurs there in a limestone formation that is older geologically than that which produces in Turner Valley. So the Leduc discovery not only gave new promise to a large and relatively unexplored area, it also indicated an additional formation in which oil may be expected.

As a natural result, exploration since then has been concentrated largely in the area within a hundred mile radius of Edmonton, and a spectacular number of new finds has been made.

First there was the northern extension of Leduc—at Woodbend—early the following year. And in September of 1948 the Redwater field, 30 miles northeast of Edmonton was discovered. Even in its early history Redwater was recognized as the continent's most important new field of 1948. Since then extensions, especially in the case of the Simmons well, have made it one of the large fields of North America, with reserves now estimated at some 500 million barrels—about twice as large as Leduc.

This year an even more dramatic discovery was made at Golden Spike. The estimated average thickness of the oil-producing section at Redwater is 65 feet, and at Leduc 33 feet. At Golden Spike only two producing wells have been drilled but in both the oil-bearing zone is in excess of 500 feet. Although the extent of the field is not yet known, we believe reserves eventually will be measured in hundreds of millions of barrels.

South of Leduc at Stettler, another promising new find has been made. It is too early to evaluate its size but indications point strongly to another important field.

Still other discoveries in 1949 include Bon Accord, Joseph Lake, Whitemud, Normandville, and Excelsior. These may or may not lead to the development of sizeable oil fields but they point up the fact that the general area offers great promise.

Normandville is of special significance because of its distance from the other discoveries. It is 240 miles northwest of Edmonton near the Peace River and it has greatly stimulated exploratory activity in this northern area.

Altogether, oil reserves discovered in Alberta in the two years following—and including—Leduc are estimated at one billion barrels. Since that time, that is since last March, the newer discoveries have given a good start on the second billion.

Furthermore, the exploration effort is still on the increase and, as a result, the rate of discovery should be further accelerated. In the prairie area more than 100 million acres of oil and gas rights have been taken up for exploration. More than 100 Canadian and U.S. companies and syndicates are active, and the number continues to grow. Dozens of surface geological crews and 109 seismograph and gravity meter survey outfits are now in the field.

In Alberta, the total spending for exploration and the related programs of development this year will exceed $100 millions. That is about 10 times the amount spent only three years ago.

Obviously no one knows what measure of success this intensive effort will have. But we do know that only a small fraction of Canada's 475,000 square miles of prospective oil territory has been tested. As a basis of comparison, Canada has about one-third as much prospective oil territory as the United States which is expected to produce 60 billion barrels from known fields. If we assume that the prospective areas of Canada are equally rich, then Canada should ultimately produce 20 billion barrels.

Of course this is entirely speculation because productivity varies widely between different areas. For example, Texas comprises about 1/12 of the area of the United States but has about one-half of its oil reserves.

However, even the more conservative estimates place Canada's undiscovered reserves at "several" billion barrels and some geologists predict that we will have proved five billion barrels within five years. Certainly it can be said that we are well on our way to self-sufficiency in oil, and we may have more than enough for our own requirements.

It should be emphasized that self-sufficiency will be attained only through venturing a staggering amount of risk capital. The discoveries of the past three years may tend to make us forget the barren decades which went before. But the search for oil is still a costly and uncertain business. Although the odds have been shortened somewhat, the long term record shows that only one of every 20 wildcat wells is a producer. And the cost of a single wildcat may range from less than $100,000 to more than a million.

A leading authority on the economics of oil estimates that before we can hope to bring production up to the level of Canada's current demand there must be an investment of almost a billion dollars. Or, to bring it closer home, the equivalent of about $300 from every family in Canada.

That, of course, is only one side of the story: we should also consider the contribution such an investment will make to the economy of the west and of Canada as a whole. Already the western fields, although producing under restrictions, have brought important benefits.

Understandably, those benefits have been most apparent in the province of Alberta. The invigorating influence of oil industry spending amounting on average to $2 millions a week has been reflected throughout the business structure of the province. Population and employment have increased. New industries have been established and others are contemplated.

Almost as important to the citizens of Alberta are the increased revenues their government is receiving as a by-product of the oil development. The province, as you may know, receives a royalty of one barrel of oil out of every eight produced on Crown lands, which comprise about 90 per cent of the total area of the province. This royalty at present yields about $20,000 a day and will increase as production increases. Since Leduc the Alberta government has also collected $22 millions from the sale of leases to Crown reserves, practically all of it within the past year, and more than $6 millions in fees and rentals. When you consider that the population of Alberta is less than that of the city of Toronto you have some idea of the effect of this income on the provincial economy. It has been estimated that at present some 30 per cent of the Alberta government's total revenue is derived from the oil industry—and that is exclusive of the nine cent tax on every gallon of gasoline sold.

But perhaps the most tangible benefit to Albertans and to the people of the prairie provinces generally has been the reduction in the prices of petroleum products. Because lower cost Alberta crude has displaced the uneconomic sources on which prairie refineries were formerly dependent, product prices are substantially lower than they could have been otherwise. Price reductions made last year cut the prairie consumers' annual bill for gasoline, tractor distillate and other fuels by about $9 millions.

The new oil production should lead to a more balanced economy for the prairies. As I have mentioned, development along these lines is already taking place in Alberta. It will be reflected too in increased prairie refining capacity. A new 16,000 barrel a day refinery went into operation at Edmonton last year. Two others are projected for that area and expansions are under way or contemplated at Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Regina, Brandon and Winnipeg. At least $30 millions will be spent in the next two years to increase prairie refinery capacity to more than 80,000 barrels a day. That is as much oil as was refined in the entire Dominion only 20 years ago.

When we turn to the effects of the new oil on Canada as a whole we must keep in mind that a more prosperous, better balanced prairie area will inevitably have favorable repercussions throughout the Dominion. On one hand, it means a more receptive market for products made in the east and on the west coast. And on the other, lower cost operation for western agriculture and industry must ultimately benefit the whole of Canada.

Capable of more exact measurement is the contribution domestic oil production is making to the solution of our most serious economic problem. Petroleum is the largest single factor determining our exchange situation. In terms of U.S. dollars we have been importing more crude oil and refined products than we have of any other commodity; and by some coincidence Canada's dollar shortage last year happened to be almost precisely the same as the dollar value of our petroleum imports. Oil from Alberta wells means that this year we will save 90 million of those scarce American dollars.

Finally, Canada's development has been predicated to a considerable degree on petroleum; so much so that Canadians use, per capita, more oil than any nation in the world except our neighbour to the south. In the past we have been dependent largely on foreign sources of supply. The added security of large oil reserves within our borders is of fundamental importance not only to Canada but to this hemisphere.

I think you will agree that these benefits—to Alberta, to the prairies and to Canada—have been substantial. And they will become even greater as more reserves are found and developed, and as markets for western oil are found beyond the prairie provinces which are its present economic limit.

It would be too much to expect that developments of such importance could be crowded into less than three years without the industry suffering some growing pains.

The most serious have been caused by wells coming into production faster than it has been possible to find economic outlets for their output. Since last summer when production began to outstrip prairie refining capacity, each new well has meant that all the wells must be restricted in output. While Alberta now is able to produce about 125,000 barrels of oil a day from existing wells, actual production has been limited by the economically accessible market to 60 to 65 thousand barrels. Even on this restricted basis, however, Alberta's oil production in 1949 is estimated to be worth about $56 millions at the well head, almost half the value of Canada's entire gold production last year.

New markets will not be found until lower cost transportation is available. As you probably know, crude oil is a world commodity and it has a world price. It is sold in any given market at a price determined by world competition, and the amount received by the producer is that price less the cost of transportation to such market.

In this respect Alberta is at a considerable disadvantage. Generally speaking the large oil-producing areas of the world are close to water and to inexpensive water transport. Others are close to pipe lines built at lower cost than is possible today. For instance, Arabian oil is moved from the Persian Gulf through the Suez Canal to the Atlantic seaboard, more than 7,500 miles, for $1.40 a barrel.

Alberta oil, on the other hand, lies in an area bounded by the broad stretches of the Rocky Mountains on one side and by more than a thousand miles of land to the lakehead on the other. It cannot find new markets without overcoming these great transportation handicaps.

As an example, competitive oil from Illinois and Oklahoma can be laid down in Sarnia for $3.53 a barrel, a price which gives producers in those states a reasonable return after meeting production and transportation costs. The rail freight alone from Edmonton to Sarnia would run about $3.25 a barrel. So that to back out present supplies at Sarnia by rail the western producer would have to accept only 28 cents a barrel for his oil. Obviously, at that return there is no incentive either to continue producing oil or to search for new fields.

The eventual need for a pipe line to provide low-cost transport was recognized as a probability soon after the Leduc discovery and planning was started, on paper, more than two years ago. As you know, Interprovincial Pipe Line Co. has already started work on a pipe line from Edmonton to the Great Lakes. It will be 1,150 miles in length—among the longest in the world—and will be built in three sections: from Edmonton to Regina; Regina to Gretna, Manitoba, on the International boundary; and from Gretna to Superior, Wisconsin, at the western tip of Lake Superior. On its way, it will pass through, or near, present refining centres on the prairies and on arrival at Superior the oil will be trans-shipped by lake tanker to Canada's largest refinery at Sarnia and to other refineries in Ontario.

To assist in the movement from Superior, two lake tankers—almost twice the size of the largest now plying the Lakes—will be constructed at a total cost of about $8 millions. Each will be able to carry more than four million gallons of oil on each voyage and more than five million barrels during a seven months season of navigation.

Initial capacity of the pipe line will be 95,000 barrels a day to Regina and 70,000 barrels a day to the lakehead, with the delivery at Superior in the summer of 1951 expected to be between 50,000 and 60,000 barrels a day. However, by installing additional pumping stations capacity can be increased to a total intake at Edmonton of about 150,000 barrels a day and to an output of some 103,000 barrels at the lakehead.

It is expected that the pipe line will be completed next year and that oil will be flowing through it as far as Regina in the fall and to the lakehead by the opening of navigation in 1951. Cost of transporting a barrel of crude through the line will be less than a third of the cost by rail.

Completion of the line will add substantially to the benefits accompanying the western development. In Alberta, of course, there will be still greater business activity as oil production increases, still higher revenues for the government; across the prairies further reductions in product prices can be expected as the crude moves out to wider markets; and nationally there should be an additional saving of $40 millions a year in U.S. exchange.

It may be of interest that in sponsoring the Interprovincial Pipe Line Co., Imperial Oil's primary concern was in getting oil to market, not in getting into the pipe line business. Consequently, Imperial is retaining only one-third of the equity in the pipe line company. Twenty-five per cent will be held by other oil companies, who, like Imperial, are guaranteeing traffic for the line and so making it financially possible. The remainder, just short of 42 per cent, is in the hands of the general public.

Ordinary common sense tells us that the lower the cost of building and operating the pipe line the more competitive Alberta's oil will be. Conversely, anything which adds to its cost or impairs its efficiency will limit the area it can serve and will mean that the benefits of the western oil development will not be realized to the fullest possible extent.

These were the determining considerations in arriving at the route of the line. Engineering studies indicated that an all-Canadian route would be 121 miles longer to lakehead; it would require at least an additional $10 million to build; the increased operating cost would be about one million dollars annually; and it would delay the completion of the line by one year. It was obvious that the less costly route to Superior was in the best interests of the Canadian economy and that there was no logical alternative.

The question of an all-Canadian route is perhaps of academic interest at the moment, since all the major steps of authorization and financing have been completed on the most efficient basis that we have been able to devise. Yet it does reveal that the rapid growth of a new industry brings problems in understanding as well as problems in engineering. And unless understanding keeps pace with engineering, the national interest can easily be obscured by proposals that are superficially attractive but which will not stand analysis.

Western oil has already started to flow eastward. Refineries of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are now being supplied with Alberta oil. And the pipe line is being built to help supply Ontario where a substantial market is available on a competitive basis. This market, if fully developed, would absorb the entire initial throughput of the pipe line.

However, by the time the pipe line begins operation, the pressure of Alberta oil will demand an even greater outlet. When definite plans for the line to the lakehead were formulated last spring, Alberta reserves were estimated at one billion barrels—an amount sufficient to supply the line at its initial rate for about 25 years. Since that time other discoveries have been made, as previously mentioned, and by the spring of 1951—when the line is in operation—reserves will probably have increased to two billion barrels.

If these reserves are found, the problem of an adequate outlet for Alberta crude will not be solved permanently by this pipe line. It is likely to be a continuing problem of serious proportions because of the ever-increasing volume of oil seeking an outlet and the great distances to adequate markets.

This problem would be partially solved if the United States considers it desirable to import oil and Canada considers it in the national interest to export some of her crude to the U.S. Such exports could be regarded as a means of payment, with Canadian oil in lieu of U.S. dollars, for oil we import at refining centres remote from producing fields in the west.

It is safe to conclude that Canada is witnessing only the beginning of a new era in oil development and in the transportation problems which accompany it. Other pipe lines will probably have to be built to provide markets for the ever-increasing flow of Alberta's wells.

Considering that so much has been said and written recently about the development of oil in Alberta and its significance, what I have said may not be new to many of you. However, I hope I have been able to convey to you something of the extent and importance of the oil development in western Canada. And perhaps, also, to impress upon you that great developments, such as the one we are now witnessing, are inevitably associated with great problems—problems which we believe are being solved in the best interest of all Canada.

"MUSIC AND MUSICIANS"

An Address By

ETTORE MAZZOLENI, B.A., Mus.D.
Principal, The Royal Conservatory of Music
of Toronto

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, December 15th, 1949

Mr. Colebrook:

Honoured Guests and Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to again have the ladies with us for our Christmas meeting. No doubt, our large attendance today, is due in no small measure to the happy memories of two years ago, when our Distinguished Guest of today, spoke to us on the needs of cultural and spiritual values in the building of peace.

Today Doctor Mazzoleni is not only with us again in person to give us a talk on Music and Musicians, but he has very kindly arranged through Mr. Hodgins, to bring with him a group of Choristers from Grace Church-on-The-Hill, to whom we extend a very hearty welcome.

Just a few remarks regarding our Guest of Honour, other than those recited on your announcement cards: In 1929 Doctor Mazzoleni was appointed to the faculty of Upper Canada College and immediately took an active part in the musical life of Toronto; being shortly afterwards appointed lecturer and examiner at the Royal Conservatory of Music and Director of its Symphony Orchestra.

In 1943 he was appointed Associate Conductor of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra.

In 1945 he was appointed Principal of the Royal Conservatory, and in 1948 he resigned his post with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra to devote his time to the administration of the rapidly expanding Conservatory Organization.

In June, 1949, he received the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Music from the University of Rochester.

We are indeed delighted to have with us again—Doctor Mazzoleni whom I will now call upon to address us on—MUSIC AND MUSICIANS!

DR. MAZZOLENI:

To begin with I must thank you, Sir, for your gracious invitation to speak to the Empire Club to-day. It is always flattering to be invited to speak to so representative a gathering—but in this case so much more flattering when I recall that the last time you were good enough to extend a similar invitation to me, I accepted.

That was three years ago, and I remember with great pleasure the warm and friendly reception you gave me on that occasion. I also remember with particular pleasure that it was Ladies Day. I hope I shall not be misunderstood if I suspect that each Fall there comes a critical moment when you turn to your Speakers' committee and say, 'Gentlemen, Christmas is coming. That means the ladies will be coming to lunch and we must entertain them. Let's ring up the Principal of the Conservatory.'

You see, I am a musician—not a speaker—and my job is putting into what I believe to be their rightful place musical notes and sounds, not words. For that reason, you must forgive me if I am somewhat diffident. Every time I am called on to speak, I feel rather like the conductor in a story the great English composer Edward Elgar used to tell. In his youth, Elgar was a violinist. On one occasion he was playing a concerto with the local orchestra. After the final rehearsal the conductor, as usual, thanked the members of the orchestra for their co-operation and attention, and the help they had given him in preparing the concert. "There is one favour I would ask of you to-night" he said. "You know your part and I know mine. Please, none of you look at me to-night. It makes me nervous."

My subject, on which I am going to speak to you very briefly and very informally, is 'Music and Musicians'.

Now musicians may be composers, performers, teachers, even critics—but not very often—and I feel that I cannot use my time more profitably than by speaking about composers, the most respected and the most underpaid members of the musical profession—although I remember the story of an exchange between the very popular young American composer, George Gershwin, who was visiting Paris in the Spring of 1928, and the Russian composer Stravinsky, who was then living in Paris and was noted for his brilliant orchestral scores. Being very anxious to learn something about orchestration Gershwin got in touch with Stravinsky to ask how much he would charge for lessons in orchestration. "How much do you make a year?" asked Stravinsky in reply. "About $100,000." said Gershwin. There was a pause, and then Stravinsky said, "How about your giving me lessons?"

The position of the composer to-day, as I read history, is vastly different from his position in the days of church and court patronage, and in the days of the great romantic movement of the 1800s, and it might be interesting to point out briefly how the composer has changed through the centuries in his typical character, and how the present-day musician compares in temperament and social grace with his forerunners.

In the first place, the composer generally works in solitude and quiet. Perhaps for that reason, and because the attitude of his audience has always profoundly affected his work—even when he has claimed to ignore his audience or to be far in advance of it—the composer particularly seems to enjoy the fun of making music with others when he is at rest from his own labours.

Up to about the end of the 16th century the chief patron of music was the Church. Music was then one of the many factors in the religious atmosphere with which the Church tried to surround her followers, and the Church musician, nurtured in the faith and often protected by his office from outside influences, gave the best that was in him. Those were the days of the purest choral traditions.

But we know that at the same time madrigal singing was one of the favorite pastimes of musicians as well as of wealthy musical amateurs. Thomas Morley describes a typical scene in an Elizabethan home when, after dinner, the hostess would bring out the part-books, and family and guests would all join in the singing of madrigals. It was the part of every gentleman's education, at that time, to sing at sight.

Much of the music which was sung at these sessions was never intended for posterity: in fact much of it has been lost, most of the magnificent poems have remained anonymous, and those scores which have survived have been reconstructed from the singers' parts, since the composers did not take the trouble to preserve their works for anyone but their own circle.

This was home music, not concert music, and very often the parts were marked "apt for viols or voices", so that stringed instruments could be used in place of voices or in combination with them.

Although this singing of madrigals was apparently not indulged in by the lower classes, it meant a very democratic principle among the upper circles, because everyone could take part and no one had a more interesting part than his neighbour. It was not like the barber shop quartet which I once heard described as consisting of three singers and a tenor. As for the composer, he was one with the company, whether it was made up of fellow-musicians or music lovers.

When we come to the following century, the Commonwealth period in England, we find this type of merry music-making exemplified by the following extract from the writings of the Puritan composer, Roger l'Estrange: 'Being in St. James His Parke, I heard an Organ Touched in a little low Room of one Mr. Hinckson's. I went in, and found a Private Company of some five or six Persons. They desired me to take up a Viole, and bear a Part. I did so . . . By and by (without the least colour of

Design or Expectation) in comes Cromwell. He found us Playing—and so he left us.' A commentary on the healthy state of music at the time, and also on the sad lack of musical appreciation in British statesmen which has lasted right up to the present day.

At Oxford and Cambridge group singing and playing were popular from the earliest times, and "musique meetings", originating in the universities, developed into the famous catch and glee clubs of the eighteenth century, many of which are still in existence to-day.

The most prominent of these was the Noblemen's and Gentlemen's Catch Club, founded in 1761 and still holding regular monthly meetings. In its early days the famous Dr. Charles Burney was a frequent visitor, and Haydn dropped in at one of the meetings on his visit to England. The meetings were not entirely musical, or so one gathers from the early minute-books, where it is stated that at each meeting one bottle of sherry was to be provided for every three members, and one bottle of madeira for every seven members, and further that politics or religion were not to be talked during meetings.

Smoking and drinking were evidently a part of all the glee club sessions: the Canterbury Catch Club, one of the earliest of its kind, mentions the serving of gin punch and mutton pies during meetings. And the Catch Club of Calcutta, whose weekly meetings began at 10 o'clock at night and continued until dawn, were always broken by an interval for "a kettle of burnt champagne as soon as the clock struck two."

No wonder musicians occasionally long for a return to the good old days.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, during which the aristocratic patron paid the piper and therefore called the tune produced a great mass of music, much of it of merely passing interest but also much of real value. In those days a composer was socially of no account. Either he was a court musician, in which case he was a lackey; or he was a church organist, in which case his pay was wretchedly poor. If his employer were an enthusiast he might be lucky, but too often the princely employers were imitating, so far as their means would allow, the Court of Versailles, and very often they were doing things 'on the cheap' since they were rarely as rich as they pretended to be.

The conditions under which the great school of German symphonic writers developed were remarkable. Central Europe was divided into a multitude of small states, each with its own Prince trying to maintain his own band of musicians for the entertainment of his guests. Small wonder then that composers did not always bother to lavish their best talents on audiences which often paid very little attention to their works. Opera, in particular, was a social rather than an artistic event, and audiences thought nothing of chatting freely during the evening when their favourite singers were not on the stage. And yet there was some sort of security for the composer, as a paid servant, which must have left him free in the matter of composition. To this, I suppose, we can owe much of the elegance and charm which belong to the music of Haydn and Mozart.

In the musician of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries we see then a man who was fond of good music, good company, and good fun. But with the nineteenth century the character of the composer changed.

The French Revolution, involving a violent upheaval of European society, had a profound effect on the outlook of the musician, throwing him into contact with a wider public. Beethoven has been called the prophet of the Revolution, and there is no doubt his personal eccentricities helped to cast a further glamour over his name.

With the romantic movement in all the arts under way the musician was bound to become a man of exaggerated tastes and passions and a romantic view of life and art. One example that immediately springs to mind is, of course, Hector Berlioz.

At the age of fourteen Berlioz is reported to have been carried away by the charms of a local belle who wore pink shoes. Later he wooed a Shakespearean actress and a famous woman pianist, without much success in either case. Eventually he married the actress, but she died of a broken heart when he jilted her for a singer. When the singer died, Berlioz consoled himself by seeking out the lady with the pink shoes, by now a widow. She refused to marry him, but did allow him to stand as godfather to one of her grandchildren.

Liszt is another obvious example. Dazzling London society when he was only thirteen by his extraordinary performances on the 'New Grand Piano Forte invented by Sebastian Erard' he became one of the first great travelling virtuosi, living frenziedly between love-affairs and a desire to be a great saint and social reformer, but possibly at no time as unscrupulous a bounder in his private life as the great operatic composer Wagner.

The domestic paterfamilias and noble church-musician, Johann Sebastian Bach, the tidy and methodical court-musician, Joseph Haydn, had given way to the romantic novelist's stock types, the eccentric old recluse—Beethoven—and the theatrical gay young Lothario—Franz Liszt—whose lives were just as sensational as the public could desire.

But with the early years of this century the musician, somewhat unfortunately, tended to take too clinical a view of himself and his work. A number of European festivals sprang up where small cliques of avant-garde composers and performers gathered together to hear and praise each other's latest musical (or unmusical) outrages. The meetings were usually very sober and the atmosphere forbiddingly serious and hightoned. A disturbing note at one such session was the first participation of an English musician in the I.S.C.M. Festival, around 1921. The work was a Quartet by William Walton, and the English government being completely ignorant of the tenseness and serious professional air of the Festival had sent as their representative performers four prim young English schoolgirls. A regular commotion was caused when the 'cellist inadvertently placed the spoke of her 'cello on the latch of the stage's only trapdoor, and the four players descended from view before they had played a note of the music. The effect on the sober meeting may well be imagined.

In more recent years, musicians have come to see more and more the value of a sense of humour and of a regular, rational mode of life. Indeed, it is doubtful whether you could to-day tell a musician, if you met him on the street, from a plumber or an insurance salesman.

The great change which has come over the face of music in recent years has had a lot to do with this. The spread of musical education through the schools, the invention of radio and recording, have created a larger audience for the musician than ever before existed. You possibly know that the largest capitalized industry on the North American continent to-day is entertainment, and music is the basis of entertainment. Musicians can no longer indulge too much in their own professional jargon, talking in terms to be understood only by the very few. They can no longer with cheerless souls and uplifted voices sing the allegedly good old Calvinistic psalm:

> We are the sweet elected few,
> Let all the rest be damned.
> There's room enough in Hell for you,
> We won't have Heaven crammed.

Composers must come down from their ivory towers.

We are only now emerging from a period of over-cleverness and complexity in music. The romantic composers were out for notoriety in their private lives—the modern composers have been out for notoriety in their music.

Music, if it is to have value and if it is to survive, must express the heart and soul of man, and the composer must search for a kind of simplicity where there will be no barrier between himself and his listener. His aim should not be to create a mental tangle for himself. He must have faith, and his music must interpret his faith. It must express the inarticulate hopes of man.

Humanity is the sacred soil of art.

We have much to love and have faith in, but our faith is too lukewarm, our thinking too shallow. Perhaps that is why we can no longer write great religious music. If so, let us hope that some day a naive and simple belief may be restored so that the art of music may again be dedicated to a sublime task.

"SOME EXPERIENCES IN SHOWMANSHIP"

AN ADDRESS BY

ERIC CHRISTMAS

FAMOUS ENGLISH COMEDIAN

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, January 5th, 1950

MR. COLEBROOK:

We are fortunate in having for our first meeting of the New Year, a jovial soul who is Christmas all through the year. He is going to talk to us about—SHOWMANSHIP—and that is good because we may need quite a bit of that before we get through this year.

Our Guest Speaker was born in London, England, and has been in the entertainment world all his life—on the regular stage, music halls, radio and television.

In 1948, he and his wife and two small children came to Canada and since that time, has been very busy in his own chosen field of entertainment.

At the present time, as most of you know, he is directing and starring in the English Pantomime—Mother Goose at the Royal Alexandra—a production of the New Play Society—sponsored by the Riverdale Kiwanis Club.

The entire cast of about 70 people, excepting only Miss Oliphant, is composed of Canadians, who have been trained for this production by our versatile Guest Speaker,

MR. CHRISTMAS:

I would like to first of all explode a theory some of you may hold, that professional comedians are extremely funny people, off stage. That is not necessarily so. I have spent a great proportion of my life in the theatre and I have come to the conclusion, that to amuse people professionally is an extremely exacting job, and by no means a question of being a light-hearted, amusing, witty and easy-going person in real life. Most of the comedians of my acquaintance are men who look as if they should be more closely associated with MacDougall and Brown than with the theatrical profession.

Another fallacy concerning comedians is that the man like Uncle Charlie, who will keep you in fits in the front parlor by the hour, is going to be an enormous success on the stage. That is not so, I can assure you.

Now, I am very happy to tell that in putting on this pantomime for the last two weeks I have been as surprised as anybody at the response to the show. I was most anxious to make the show as clean (without being puritannical), as I possibly could. I feel the only good laugh is a clean laugh—and I am amazed and pleased at the response. But that is definitely a question of a reward for a job of work. We are not, as Uncle Charley is, in a room about 10 x 16. We are in a vast theatre. It is a question of giving the old lady, at the top of the top balcony who has possibly struggled in from Mimico and paid her dollar, as jolly fine an afternoon or evening as anyone else,—and that is quite a job. It is a question of projection, and applying your talents to your particular medium. It is certainly not a trivial, or lighthearted matter.

So I want to let you know that I am not necessarily going to be extremely funny for the next fifteen minutes.

I am very honoured to be here. I am also very happy, and very deeply appreciative of my first two years here in Canada. I have had a certain amount of criticism levelled at me: I have been told that I am publicity-seeking. Now it is impossible for any person in show business who is running shows or appearing in shows not to be publicity-seaking, because the publicity comes to you; often unsought. I want everybody here to know that my complete and whole-hearted intention is to stay in this country, and to work with, and for this country, and to bring my children up as citizens of this country. I do believe most sincerely that Canada has the greatest potential on this earth. That is my sound belief. That was in my heart before I came here.

I was quite successful in England, travelling around with shows and making a good living. I gave up quite a lot momentarily, but I did have immense faith in the future, and I was most anxious to come here. I had met so many Canadians during the war. I was doing shows for the Royal Air Force for five years during the war. And in the R.A.F. I came across many Canadian airmen and I found that the compromise of tradition and progress of the Canadians really sold me on this country, and that is I think the main reason I came here. I have been here just two years, and I am darned glad I came. I intend to stay until I die. I may go home once or twice on vacation but my heart and my home is here: that is my future, and I am therefore very anxious to do what I can in my own field, and I do think, that *live* entertainment is rather lacking here. To reach your public and to make them conscious of the theatre, and to raise their standards artistically, you must offer them something that is entertaining, and you must, over a long period of time, educate to something that is really worthwhile. You can not force Ibsen and Chekhov down their throats. You can slowly and with infinite patience and courage, make them realize that great plays are also great entertainment, even in our pantomime we have a Mozart flute concerto. So many people have come to me and said, "The ballet music is wonderful, who did it?" and I say "Mozart." As I say great works can be great entertainment. And that is the way the standards should be raised in the theatre, not by forcing people into it.

This summer I am going to present a musical show. I am determined to make the tone of it as clean as I have the pantomime, and I am going to travel up north, and I am going to give the holiday public holiday-entertainment, and in that I am also going to see that we have something worthwhile, and slowly, over a period of years, the public can be educated to those standards.

I have a reasonably good background in the theatre.

I trained for two years in the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art. My mother went to see the Head Master. My mother said, "What can we do?" And the Head Master said, "We can do nothing, put it on the stage." I then went to the Academy of Dramatic Art for two years. I naturally speak the Cockney. I slip into it occasionally. I have learned to speak The King's English. I was born and bred in London for many years, and for many years I lived completely in the heart of London, and when I first went to this academy I was really quite thick in Cockney. I was a Cockney office boy, and in playing this part, I came on just as myself, and won a scholarship on this brilliant performance just by me being me.

After that I had a wonderful period for seven months doing absolutely nothing. That is the time you work in the theatre when you are not working. That is when you have to look your best, behave as though you owned the world, and turn your nose up at a job you would give your life to have. I had seven months of that, and then I got a wonderful job on the Program. I was Assistant Stage Manager in the theatre, I was chore boy, furniture mover, everything as menial as it could be. It was a wonderful show, and I would sit in the corner every night, and they were all absolutely bored to tears, they had done it fifty years. The only thing they were concerned with was where are we going next week? But nevertheless I enjoyed the show immensely. I did all the odd jobs around. I made 15s. a week, and made on the side 25s. selling chocolate bars in the trains on Sunday.

Then I went into vaudeville, then pantomime in the war, and for a couple of years after the war, pantomime. So I have a pretty good background. I feel honestly I come of professional background.

Miss Oliphant has been for fifteen years with the finest pantomime management in England. We do feel we have something to offer. I know, working together, a lot of publicity will come our way. But we are always helping raise standards and helping to educate the people to live entertainment.

The response has been staggering. I am amazed to think people are in such need of good clean live fun, absolutely amazed. The show is good, it could be much better. We fought many battles; some we won, some we did not, but I do feel we have achieved a professional show.

I was anxious to do two things: I was anxious to have a good show. I was also anxious to bring something on the right side of the ledger for the Kiwanis Club because I am very, very keen, as I say, always to make ventures solvent, and that is the only way anything will grow in the future, if anything can be good and successful.

At the same time we have many plans for the future. I don't know whether I shall be in Toronto next year or not, that is a question that is in the lap of the gods for the moment. I should like to do another show. I am definitely going to spread around the rest of Ontario, and as I say, do the show up north in the coming summer time.

I am talking completely about my own business, because it is something—I don't know how many have been associated with show business, but it is in your blood. There is nothing you can do about it, and neither would one want to do anything about it. You hear all about these people moaning, groaning, beefing, but they stay in, and we have found some wonderful material in our work here. There is one little kid in our show. She has been to every rehearsal on time, and we really worked hard for two months. It was the only way to make the thing go, you have to do a thing properly and you have to work, and she worked for two months, and she is too small to put in anything except to stand at the back of the stage in the Finale, with a wooden trumpet in her hand, and that kid has been wonderful. We found about ten or twelve others like that, and it is in her blood and it is also in the blood of the others I know. And we feel we can slowly but surely build up a tradition and a real live theatrical following here in Canada, and that, as it is my business, that is something I know, that is my intention for the future.

We insisted on every person in our show being paid this year. I am a professional, and that is the way the show should work. Everybody has been paid, we have brought employment to over 100 people. I am hoping in the future we shall bring employment to several thousand. I want to say in this immense talent, there is one big lack, there is a lack of showmanship. There is a lack of standing up on the table and saying, "Look at us, we are pretty good." Not to be oppressive but to use tact and discretion. You should know exactly how long a movement will hold, when it is due to be finished. In other words, timing is an essential part of showmanship. There should be proper timing. But there should definitely be more showmanship, more presentation of Canadian talent.

I do a lot of work on the radio. The radio here is, so far as I am concerned, on as high a scale as anywhere in the world. I have learned a great deal from the standards of radio. I am speaking now of the live theatre. Canada should be represented, there should be the feeling that it is a Canadian show. I am relying in the initial stages on people with an Old Country background as well, because the theatre there is as virile as ever. Even in the short space of time I have been here today I have spoken to many people who know what it is all about, they have spoken of theatres out home, two people have spoken about theatres I know very well. It is that familiarity with the live theatre which I know can be made in Canada.

It is fantastic to me to see a CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION with such a great percentage of foreign talent in it. That staggers me. I was amazed to see that when I came here. I don't think it should be so. And I don't mean that nobody but Canadians should be there. The general training of performance should be Canadian but the basis of the Canadian National Exhibition and the bulk of the talent and influence and the parades should of course be Canadian, and a national show if it is Canadian—and I know it can be done.

I also want to, and intend to encourage, a love of Empire, and I want you to know we play in our Finale "Land of Hope and Glory". We wanted to play something else. Suddenly someone played "Land of Hope and Glory". I said, "That seems funny." I noticed the moment that tune was played the girls perked up, and quite spontaneously, and you know there is the greatest thrill to me in our show to that tune, and I believe a little patriotism would not do any harm. It is there, it is through the medium of my business that it can be done, because if a thing is made attractive and entertaining it will sell its point, and I think that the Empire and the spirit of Empire—after all that is the reason we are all here today, because of the great Empire we have, is it not? And that tune has always been one of the great thrilling, heart-throbbing tunes for me. Every night the band plays it better than any other tune in the show, everybody lights up immediately to it.

I have in the back of my mind a complete synopsis for a pageant of Empire, not the usual historical text book presentation, not the usual page after page of events represented as truly as a nation could be, with every detail absolutely correct—I think you have to be a little more clever in approaching your public. My intention is to present the pageant through the eyes of a little boy, to start the show with a rural school in Canada, and a little boy of nine who is having trouble with history, and who says to the teacher, "If only it was in front of him instead of in his book, he would understand much more the background of his country and his empire." And with the boy's imagination, with the whole show presented through the mind of the boy, you can immediately do things in a much more showmanlike and showy way, and at the same time most sincerely, because, after all, there is no more sincere mind than the mind of a child, and not a more fervent imagination than the imagination of a child. Instead of giving just the effect, my Indians would be live, warwhooping Indians, we would have a big war dance, a waving of tomahawks. In other words the whole show would be through the mind, and at the same time we could, I know, instil in our audience a deep and completely solemn and sincere realization and glory in our country and in our Empire. And that would be the way to do it, and that is the way I intend to do it.

I have the whole show completely mapped out from beginning to end. I could have the whole show set up in two weeks' time.

First of all, it would be a good show. I know that it would be something really worthwhile for Canadians, and I feel quite sure it would be financially successful. If you offer something worthwhile people will come in to see it. That is one of the things I intend to do, because I was for two years in the Boy Scout Movement and we were responsible for a great increase in the membership and in the public appreciation of the Boy Scout movement. I have done it before and I can do it again—to present a pageant of Empire about which people will say, "Wasn't that a wonderful show?" And then will say, "Don't we live in a wonderful country!" That is one of my biggest aims and intentions.

I am not going to leave you without anything humorout. I felt the only way to instil humor would be to tell you a couple of jokes. My first joke is concerning a Scotsman and an Irishman and an Englishman, and the second joke is concerning London.

The first joke is about three unfortunate men who were in prison and they were all sentenced to be flogged. Whether that agrees with our principles or not. And the Englishman bares his back, and is just about to be flogged, when the guard said, "Is there anything you would like on your back to ease the pain?" He said, "Yes, put a little oil on it." He was flogged, and took it like a real man.

The Irishman, a big fellow, 6′3″, told the guard, "Nothing on my back, nothing."

And the Scotsman came along, and the guard asked him, "Is there anything you would like on your back?"

He said, "If you don't mind I will have that Irish fellow."

The other joke is a Cockney joke. I don't know how many of you come from London. It is about a Cockney family who were evacuated to the country during the war, and the father thought he would take advantage of it to have his son learn to speak a clear English. He went to the Vicarage, and told the Vicar, "I am going to take advantage to get my boy to speak properly. Would you get after him and see what you can do with him."

The Vicar said, "If he is with me during a period of six months, during which time he will see neither his father, nor his mother, and if you will come back in six months' time you will hear your son speak as you wish."

The father went away for the six months. He then came back to the Vicarage, and told the Vicar when he came to the door, "I am calling for my son George."

The Vicar said, "All right, wait, I will get him." (The Vicar spoke in pure Cockney).

I feel sincerely honoured in being here today. I feel that Canada, as I say, should stand up as far as showmanship is concerned. The talent here is great, and you have a great potential.

Another thought just occurred to me. I think, if through our country and through the wonderful deep powerful unity of Our Empire we do show the world how great and how simple and how beautiful peace and unity can be, then we shall achieve something everlasting.

"VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE OTTAWA SCENE"

AN ADDRESS BY

BLAIR FRASER

POLITICAL OBSERVER, MACLEAN'S MAGAZINE

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, January 12th, 1950

MR. HERMANT:

Members and Guests of The Empire Club of Canada:

We are to hear an address today by Mr. Blair Fraser, the Political Observer for MacLean's Magazine in Ottawa. A Maritimer, Mr. Fraser taught school for a year following his graduation from Acadia University. He began his career as a journalist with the Montreal Star, following which he spent ten years on the editorial staff of the Montreal Gazette, where he became Associate Editor. In 1943 he joined MacLean's Magazine. Mr. Fraser has also done special broadcasting for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. While with MacLean's he has covered the Prime Ministers' Conference in London in 1944, the United Nations Organization Meeting in San Francisco in 1945, the Paris Peace Conference in 1946. Mr. Fraser, himself, however, says that his main job is covering politics and national affairs in Ottawa.

Those of us who know Mr. Fraser through his broadcasts and through his articles in MacLean's, look forward to an intelligent, dispassionate and keenly analytical account of the various aspects of the Ottawa Scene, with which he is so familiar.

MR. FRASER:

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen:

I got a letter the other day that horrified me. Somebody wrote in about an article we ran on book censorship. He agreed with the article, he said; Canadian censorship was silly, utterly ridiculous. Then he said:

"What's behind it? There must be a pay-off somewhere."

Somebody's doing something I don't like—he must be a crook. All politicians are crooks anyway. Who's bribing this man? You can see the pattern in his mind.

Now that's a rather extreme example, but I find a streak of this attitude in most people. I'm sure my correspondent would agree with me, as everyone in this room would agree, that democracy is the finest form of government ever devised by man. We accept that as a platitude, a bromide.

But most of us don't quite mean it. We talk about democracy as if it were a dream, an ideal still to be achieved, instead of a system that's been working for 150 years. We pay it lip service in the same breath as we damn politics and politicians, the methods and the men that make it work. We're like a man who gets terribly sentimental to the tune of Mother Machree, and hardly ever sees his own mother because he's ashamed of her grammar.

I don't think this is good enough. Here we are in the middle of a cold war that may well be the decisive engagement—pray God the only engagement—in World War III. In every free country in the world democracy is under fire, has enemies internal and external. If we're going to defend democracy effectively we have to know what it is and defend it as it is, not as we think it ought to be.

Heaven knows any political reporter gets to be an authority on the drawbacks, the limitations of democracy. We see it day in and day out in its kitchen clothes, with its hair down and no make-up on. But I for one believe, and I hope today to show, that the limitations are not the politician's fault. They're our fault, the fault of the electors. Of all the disabilities in our political system, and they are many, I can't think of one that isn't imposed by the voter.

First, let's look at personnel. What kind of man does democracy attract, to run its machinery? What kind of man is the average M.P.?

Right away you come to Limitation Number One. Parliament's often called a representative assembly, a cross-section of Canada. It's not. Practically all its 255 members are self-employed men—mostly lawyers and farmers, a few doctors and engineers and insurance agents. Almost no employees, almost nobody who works in private life for salary or wages.

That can be a serious handicap. Your M.P. has to make a conscious effort of the imagination to put himself in the place of the employed man, to study the problems of the average worker. But who's to blame for this occupational imbalance? The employers. If they as a class really believed in democracy, an employee could afford to run for Parliament. He wouldn't be throwing away all of his security as he must today; he wouldn't have to run an economic risk so forbidding that not one employee in ten thousand will take it.

Aside from his job, what's the character of your typical back-bencher? What's he like, as a man?

It's fashionable to sneer at him, as you know; he's the butt of most political stories. But having seen a good deal of him over the past seven or eight years, I've found him a pretty decent fellow.

As a general rule he's the joiner type. He usually has a background with a service club, or the Masonic order, or some such organization. Quite often he's had an apprenticeship without pay in municipal politics.

Evidently, then, he's a man who enjoys the sense of leadership in his community. Of course we all do, in a way, but most of us are not willing to pay the price—we don't like to be dragged out to meetings in the evening, or to be loaded up with committee work. The M.P. pays that price.

Why does he go into politics? Certainly not to make money—almost all M.P.s lose money in politics, or at least make less than they could by staying out and tend-ing their own business. Most of them go in because they like it.

I was talking to one last night. "I like this life," he said. "Most of these fellows tell you they're in politics to serve the public. In my case, that is strictly hooey. If I weren't here I'd be back riding the plough and milking the cows, and I like this a lot better."

Even in his case I don't think it's entirely hooey that he wants to do a job for his community. I think the average M.P. is, or was, an idealist at heart who went into politics partly, at least, because he wanted to serve his country.

Mind you, I don't want to build up the back-bencher into a Sir Galahad. He has his faults like anybody else, each one his own set, and one or two faults seem to be pretty common among politicians.

For one thing—there are a lot of honorable exceptions to this, but it's a fair generality—he isn't particularly noted for his sense of humor. He tends to take himself and his party pretty seriously. At a meeting last summer in a small Ontario town, I listened to one candidate holding forth on the glory and grandeur of the Liberal Party.

"The Liberal is a reformer," he said. "I say this in all reverence, but the greatest of all reformers, the One Who died on the Cross—He was a Liberal. And why? Because He was a friend of publicans and sinners."

I wouldn't call that a typical example. But if you read Hansard, you'll see that a fair number of M.P.s don't always realize when they're being funny.

On the whole, though, your back bencher is a pretty likeable fellow—and the fact that he can stay likeable is a credit to him. For what happens to this man when he's made the great decision to run for office?

By nature he's usually a man of sincerity and candor. He finds himself pitched into a world where sincerity is difficult and candor is almost impossible. We voters have too many prejudices. Every time he opens his mouth he has to remember not to offend the Catholics or the Protestants, the English or the French, the labour unions or the farmers—about the only man it's safe to ignore is the landlord, or lo, the poor Indian who has no vote. The one thing no public man can afford is to be completely frank.

We had an example five or six years ago, when the Family Allowances Act was introduced. Mr. Bracken immediately denounced it as a political bribe. Mr. Drew said in effect the same thing, in even stronger language.

Now that was a candid, almost instinctive reaction shared by thousands of Canadians. It was shared by a great many Liberals—even, I think, by one or two members of the Liberal cabinet. But all these people added up to a minority of the voters. Most of us liked the idea.

Progressive Conservatives had a caucus on it. John Diefenbaker and Howard Green came out in favour of the bill—Diefenbaker said he was going to vote for it anyway, no matter what the party did. Most of the other members, at the outset, were more inclined to share the view expressed by Mr. Bracken. But the more they talked, the more they realized that the voters weren't likely to agree with them. If you look up Hansard you'll find, I think, that not a single Progressive Conservative vote was cast against Family Allowances. They had one diehard at the caucus who couldn't be persuaded to vote for it, but he *was* persuaded to stay away. And for five solid years now, the party has been trying without much success to explain that they were always in favour of Family Allowances and that any quotations to the contrary are malicious slanders.

That was an Opposition crisis. The Liberal backbencher has a worse problem—he has to adjust his conscience between his voters on one hand and, quite often, his government on the other. Theoretically the government can't do anything its members won't support; actually it's very difficult and takes a lot of courage and hardihood to stand up against a Cabinet decision.

It's done, though, from time to time. A few years ago the Ontario ministers, two of them in particular, slipped a tariff increase into the Budget. It wasn't noticed for a while, but when it finally did come out in the news, the prairie members rebelled. Ralph Maybank of Winnipeg led them into the Minister's office to announce that if that tariff boost were left in, the western Liberals would have to vote against the Budget and thus turn the Government out—they had enough votes to defeat it.

Well, they won. The Government backed down, with a very bad grace, and took the tariff item out of the budget resolutions. But it was a long time before the high brass of the Liberal Government forgave Ralph Maybank—I'm not sure they've entirely forgiven him even yet.

You may say that kind of thing, at least, isn't the voter's fault. Surely that's the fault of the government, the fault of a group of men so long accustomed to power that they think they have a right to steamroller any kind of disagreement.

But why has it got this power? Why can't our back bench M.P.s be more independent?

Because we the voters, in our infinite wisdom, insist on voting the straight party ticket. We don't vote for Joe Smith or Tim Jones, the men running in our own counties; we vote for Louis St. Laurent or George Drew or M. J. Coldwell. That's not wholly true, of course—there are a few ridings that vote, year in and year out, for a popular individual—but in the main, election trends are national trends determined by leadership. The quality of the local man is a secondary factor. He may have ideas of his own, but if he knows what's good for him he fits them into the pattern of government policy.

This habit of ours has another unfortunate result. Both the older parties tend to hand their safest seats to their weakest men. Once they make sure the party leader is protected, they seem to care more about quantity than about quality—if they have a seat they can really rely on winning, they don't waste a strong candidate there. They put their best men into the doubtful ridings, and of course the other party does the same. You know what that means—in one riding you have a bitter choice between two men who both deserve to be elected, and in the next riding you find two men who both had better stay home.

And so our idealistic M.P. finds himself, right at the start, with a few more compromises to make and frustrations to endure than he bargained for. But as he gets into the swing of his first election campaign, he runs into an even worse moral dilemma. He find he can't be strictly law-abiding and still hope to be elected.

The Canada Election Act is probably, now that we're rid of prohibition, the most hypocritical document on our statute books.

It's full of sanctimonious prohibitions that protect the voter from all kinds of corruption, even such insidious seductions as a free glass of beer or a free taxi ride to the polls. One section specifically forbids the provision of any hired conveyance to bring the voters out.

But alas, the voter is not only self-righteous, he is also lazy. If he doesn't get a free ride to the poll he won't go there at all—at least, a pretty solid percentage of voters won't. The test of a good political organization is ability to get out the vote; the way to get out the vote is to have plenty of cars on hand, and to know exactly where to send them in the last hour of election day. Those cars have to be hired; their drivers have to be paid, and pretty handsomely too. The candidate can't do this without breaking the law, and he can't get elected without doing it.

The honest M.P. ducks this dilemma by trying to know as little as possible about the actual mechanics of his own campaign—he tries not to know who pays whom for what. He has an official agent, the man designated in the Election Act as responsible for paying all election expenses, but unfortunately this official agent has to be careful not to know too much, too. He turns in an official list of expenses which are duly published after each election, but the list contains on an average about 25% of the money actually spent.

So he, too, doesn't know. I interviewed an official election agent last summer, asked him where the campaign funds came from. "I haven't the faintest idea," he said. "I know very little about politics and I don't belong to any party; I'm acting as old Joe's agent because we've been friends a long time and he asked me to."

Remember that old statuette set of the three monkeys, See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil? The first two are a portrait of a candidate and his official agent.

Another thing that gives your average politician a slightly furtive air is the whole question of campaign funds. You know how they're collected—in the main they come from wealthy individuals and corporations, they're collected at headquarters by a small group of very senior operators, and they're then doled out to the various constituencies on a basis of need. If a candidate has any money of his own, he has a hard time getting any from the party; if not, he gets it all.

I really think most M.P.s would be willing, perhaps they'd be glad to have the party finances all down in published and audited books. Certainly a good many of them would. But who really shudders at the idea? Why, the contributor. The man who puts up the money. Let the politician bear all the blame and shame of these undercover financial operations; the contributor wants to be free to sneer at them in peace, and also to collect the favors he expects without having anyone drawing embarrassing inferences.

That cloud of secrecy and shame around political party finances is a bad thing for democracy. It really gnaws at the security of an honest politician—I don't mean his financial security, I mean his inner confidence. It leads to a kind of petty blackmail that crops out at odd occasions.

Do you remember five years ago when Parliament was raising its own pay from four thousand to six thousand? The first draft of that bill, as you may recall, omitted the Senate—the government figured the Senate was pretty comfortable already. Well, there was a terrific storm of indignation in the Red Chamber, all kinds of threats to defeat the bill, denounce the Government and so on. But I understand the Government's intention wasn't really shaken until a couple of Senators who'd operated as treasurers, and fund collectors, began to pull out their little black books and mutter about what an interesting story these notes could tell if they fell into the wrong hands.

But we can't expect to be rid of this kind of thing until we, the voters, stop demanding campaign services the campaign spectacles that can't be financed in any other way.

Now our new M.P. gets into Parliament at last, and there he meets his final disillusion. He'd dreamed of acting as a statesman, making speeches that would sway the course of policy, dealing with the nation's business on a lofty plane. In fact he finds that nobody wants him to make a speech at all, that when he does speak very few members listen, and that he spends most of a long hard working day just answering his mail. He finds that his job is to look after the interests of a never-ending queue of individual voters, and to get any spare time for real national affairs he has to work day and night.

Even the most eminent of M.P.s soon learn that this is the most vital part of their function. A chap said to me the other day "You know, it's very funny to sit in at Treasury Board these days (Treasury Board is the three-headed watchdog on government expenditures) and listen to Mike Pearson, the great international statesman, fighting like a terrier for a new wharf on Manitoulin Island."

I've been outlining a few of the handicaps—not all, just a few—that we voters impose on our public men. Now, what do we get as the end product of this democratic machine? These are the pressures, these are the influence we create to turn our representatives from honest judicious men into timorous timeservers with a guilty conscience. Do those pressures work, in fact?

The answer is no, they don't. We get, gentlemen, a great deal better government in this country than we deserve.

I'm not talking about policy. There can be all sorts of opinion about rent control and income tax and devaluation and international trade. I'm talking about the character of the men we entrust with these responsibilities, and it can only be described as amazingly good, amazingly high. The leaders of political activity in this country on both sides of the House of Commons are men of ability, integrity and judgment. We the people are able to hire, for anywhere from six thousand to eighteen thousand dollars a year, brains and energy that industry couldn't hire for two or three times that.

Here in Canada we're particularly fortunate, too, in that nearly all of these men retain their humility. They aren't victims of that slight megalomania, that tendency to rank oneself as a Very Important Person, which seems to be an occupational disease among the politicians of some democracies. The Prime Minister of Canada has no bodyguard; he goes out to lunch every day alone, comes over to the Rideau Club and sits down at a club table wherever there happens to be a vacant chair. People in Ottawa admire Mr. St. Laurent for many qualities, but for none more than this total absence of self-importance, the naturalness and even diffidence that he preserves in his high office.

Gentlemen, don't let's sell democracy short. And don't let's be content with the sonorous platitudes of First-of-July oratory, don't let's be misled into cheap cynicism because our system has faults. Sure it has faults. Democracy can be improved, has been improved, must be improved all the time if we're going to win the battle that's going on all over the world. But it won't be and can't be improved until we, the electors, change the demands we impose on it. You often hear people say our politics would be fine if we could only get better men to run for office. I think if we get better men voting for them, the ones we have might do a better job than you'd think.

"THE EMPIRE, CANADA AND THE PROVINCES, 1949"

AN ADDRESS BY

HONOURABLE STUART S. GARSON, K.C.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, January 19th, 1950

MR. COLEBROOK:

Your Worship—Honourable Sirs—Honoured Guests and Gentlemen—

The title of our Distinguished Guest's address—"THE EMPIRE, CANADA AND THE PROVINCES, 1949"—is one of compelling interest to all in these critical days in which we live.

Our Guest's background, as described on your notice cards, fully illustrates his qualifications to deal with such a momentous subject—more particularly as it was he who prepared and presented the Manitoba Treasury Brief to Rowell-Sirois Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations at Winnipeg in 1937 and at Ottawa in 1938.

In 1943, he became Premier and Minister of Dominion-Provincial Relations for that Province.

In 1948, upon resigning from the Premiership, he was appointed to the very high office which he now holds—I have very great pleasure in introducing to you—

THE HONOURABLE STUART SINCLAIR GARSON, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada.

MR. GARSON:

In a democratic state it is the votes of the people, directed by the will of the people, governed by the contents of the mind of the people,—public opinion if you like—which in the last analysis determine the personnel, and to a large extent, the policies of government. This being so, few things are more important than the state of public opinion with respect to the major issues of the day. One of these major issues is the relationship of the federal and provincial governments to one another, towards our constitution, and towards its amendment.

Thus, when I have received from so distinguished an organization as your own an invitation to address it, it is perhaps not inappropriate to place before you some of the background of facts and law of this issue.

The Dominion of Canada was created as a self-governing, but not completely sovereign, dominion of the British Empire, by the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. It was that body which passed the British North America Act to unite the territory and the people of the colonies of Canada and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia into this new dominion. Canada was created a federal state like the U.S.A. rather than a unitary state like the United Kingdom. For this purpose the entire powers of government in Canada had to be divided into two parts. To the national government were assigned all national functions such as defence, tariff, trade and commerce, monetary and foreign policy and the like. To the provinces were assigned local functions such as property and civil rights, education, health, social services and charities, municipalities, roads and drainage, etc.

To support provincial functions of government which then cost very little the provinces were limited in their taxing powers to direct taxation within the province for provincial purpose.

To support what were then its more costly functions, the Federal Government was given unlimited power of taxation. The Federal Government's unlimited power of taxation—is a gauge which we can apply to demonstrate the inaccuracy of statements which we hear from time to time, even in the House of Commons. The first is that in imposing any federal tax, the Federal Government is invading the provincial field of taxation. This is obviously incorrect. For when a government with unlimited taxing powers imposes any tax whatever, it is acting within its own powers. A government with unlimited taxing powers cannot encroach upon the tax fields of other governments. The second inaccurate statement is that the Federal Government and Parliament might take advantage of a new method to amend the constitution, in order to increase its own taxing powers at the expense of provincial taxing powers. This is also quite impossible; for obviously neither a new method of amending the constitution nor action of the Federal Parliament thereunder could increase federal taxing powers which are already unlimited.

In passing I should like to point out that the municipal governments of cities, towns, rural municipalities of our country are created by the province. They thus can have no greater taxation or other powers than the province has the right to convey to them; and usually have less powers than the provinces which create them.

A great many of the Dominion, Provincial and Municipal fiscal problems have arisen, because this 1867 division of legislative functions and taxing powers is still in effect today in 1950 in spite of the fact that economic and social conditions have changed enormously in the intervening 83 years. It is not this fiscal problem itself with which I am dealing today, but the related problem of how the Federal Government and ten Provincial Governments of Canada are to work out together a method whereby we in Canada can amend our constitution so that it will be in accord with the facts of life in the era in which it has to operate. This is no abstract theoretical problem. We have national unemployment insurance today because of the constitutional amendment of 1940. Similarly, a national contributory old age pension scheme —a national health plan, and adequate marketing facilities for agricultural and other products, are examples of national benefits which may depend upon our ability to devise a workable method of amending our constitution.

In discussing methods of amendment, I first would like to establish some fundamental points. A unitary state like the United Kingdom, having no provinces, has no problem of dividing and keeping divided, powers of government and fields of taxation, between a central government and a number of provincial governments. It can get along, and has got along very well, with a less sharply defined constitution which in large part is not in writing at all. But the constitution of Canada—a federal state—must not only create this division of powers in the first place, but if Canada is to maintain its federal character, must make adequate provision for the protection of provincial powers against the encroachment by the federal authorities, and vice versa. Thus, it must necessarily be more definite and more in writing than that of a unitary state. Yet it should not be so rigid as to prevent the growth and development of the nation within the limits of the constitution; and this is particularly true of a young, dynamic, and therefore changing nation like Canada.

The British North America Act of 1867 was the first measure to be passed in the British Empire, to raise a colony to the status of a dominion. Canada was the first British colony to be so raised. One of the results of this fact was that Canada today alone amongst the British dominions has no power to amend its own constitutional act within its own boundaries and without legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. [The full implication of the change in status from colony to self-governing dominion were not appreciated in 1867. Before that time the British Parliament had passed several constitutional statutes relating to Canada as a colony. None of them contained any provisions for amendment. It was the normal thing at that time to have constitution statutes for the colonies and their amendments passed by the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. Thus, it was natural to assume that in passing the British North America Act it also, like the earlier statutes, could be amended whenever necessary by the Imperial Parliament of Westminster.]

The other British colonies which acquired dominion status later have profited by our pioneering in this field. When their constitutional acts were passed by the British Parliament, they saw to it that their statutes, unlike Canada's, provided for their own amendment. The Australian Constitutional Act of 1900, the South African Act of 1909, and the New Zealand Act, all have provision for their own amendment.

Now you may ask, seeing that we cannot ourselves amend our Canadian constitution, how in the past have we gone about the business of securing the amendments to our constitution which we required from time to time? Until the year 1949 we had ten amendments to the British North America Act. In three cases provincial interests were involved. In one case in 1930 involving the transfer of the natural resources of the three prairie provinces, only the provinces immediately affected by the amendment were consulted and all three agreed to the amendment. In two other cases all nine of the provinces were affected. In one, in 1907, involving the amount of the provincial subsidies, all of the provinces were consulted; eight approved and one, British Columbia, strongly disapproved. Yet, despite this disapproval, the amendment was granted by the Imperial Parliament without any question. In 1940 it was desired to transfer unemployment insurance from provincial jurisdiction to federal jurisdiction. All of the provinces were concerned, all were consulted, all agreed, and the amendment went through accordingly.

In the other seven of these cases provincial interests were not involved. In these seven cases the provinces, therefore, were not consulted; and the amendments were secured from time to time over a period of some eighty-odd years by joint Addresses passed by the House of Commons and the Senate of our own Canadian Parliament, upon the strength of which the Imperial Parliament passed the amendment which the joint Addresses requested.

In the meantime, a very great change had taken place in the British Empire itself. As I have pointed out, Canada was created by an Act of the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. All of these amendments that I have referred to were enacted by Imperial legislative power exercised by the Parliament of Westminster in passing laws in London which were to have effect in different parts of the Empire. One of such laws was the Colonial Laws Validity Act which provided that no law passed by the Parliament of any colony or self-governing dominion was to have any effect to the extent that it conflicted with Imperial Statutes in force in such colony or self-governing dominion. This gave the Parliament at Westminster an overriding legislative authority over all parts of the British Empire.

But in the course of the evolution of that Empire the Imperial Conference of 1926 passed what has usually been called the Balfour Declaration that:

> "They (that is the various British Dominions) are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or internal affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth."

The Imperial Statute of Westminster in 1931 gave legislative effect to this Declaration, by providing that the Colonial Laws Validity Act should not apply to any law made after the Statute of Westminster by the Parliament of a Dominion; that the Parliament of a Dominion shall have full powers to make laws having extraterritorial operation, that is to say, having effect beyond the boundaries of the Dominion itself; and that no Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom passed after the Statute of Westminster should extend to a Dominion as part of the law of that Dominion unless the Dominion has requested and consented to the enactment thereof. Thus, the British Parliament by passing the Statute of Westminster, 1931, to give legislative effect to the Balfour Declaration, made the various self-governing dominions completely sovereign and autonomous. In relation to them it divested itself of its imperial legislative authority.

One of the significant exceptions of this Statute of Westminster, however, was Section 7 which provided that nothing in the Statute of Westminster shall be deemed to apply to the repeal, amendment or alteration of the British North America Act. In other words, since by 1931 when the Statute of Westminster was passed, we Canadians had not worked out a method whereby we could amend our constitution ourselves, it was necessary for the British Parliament by this Section 7 to retain its power to do so. We must realize that this situation in which the British Parliament is called upon to rubber-stamp with legislation, the joint Address of the Canadian Parliament requesting amendments to our Canadian Constitution, is anomalous and embarrassing under the best of circumstances. It could become acutely so if any serious controversy between the provinces and Canada should develop with regard to a certain amendment which the Canadian Parliament was asking the British Parliament to provide.

Thus, at the beginning of 1949, we Canadians still fell short of exercising full nationhood and sovereignty in only two respects. The first was that we had to petition the United Kingdom Parliament to pass the United Kingdom Statute which alone can amend our Canadian constitution. The second was that the ultimate interpretation of Canadian statutes and other laws was the responsibility of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, a United Kingdom Court.

It was for the purpose of removing these last two impediments to our full sovereignty that the Canadian Parliament this past Autumn did two things. First, it passed a Statute amending the Supreme Court Act and abolishing appeals to the Privy Council. In this step it was exercising legislative powers affirmed by the Privy Council itself. Second, it passed a joint Address requesting the United Kingdom Parliament to pass an amendment to the British North America Act (which that

Parliament passed in due course as requested) empowering the Canadian Parliament to amend our constitution in respect of those matters in it which are of purely federal concern.

Ever since the British North America Act was first passed in 1867 the Provinces had always had the right to amend the B.N.A. Act in regard to matters of purely provincial concern.

Thus, the present position is that the provincial legislatures can amend concerning matters of provincial concern, the federal Parliament can amend concerning matters of federal concern, but we still have to go to the British Parliament to secure amendments concerning matters of joint concern such as historic minority rights and the distribution of legislative powers between the federal and provincial governments.

The Canadian Parliament formally recognized provincial autonomy and minority rights when this past autumn in passing a joint Address seeking powers to amend the constitution as regards matters of purely federal concern, it expressly excepted:

(1) matters assigned exclusively to the legislatures of of the Provinces by the B.N.A. Act, 1867;

(2) rights or privileges granted or secured to the legislature or government of a province by any constitutional act;

(3) rights or privileges granted or secured by the constitution to any class of persons with respect to schools;

(4) constitutional provisions regarding the use of the English and the French languages; and

(5) constitutional requirements that a session of Parliament be held once a year and that the life of the House of Commons be limited to five years, with a provision for a possible longer continuance in cases of real or apprehended war.

This reference in Parliament's joint Address to these historic minority rights was the first occasion on which any legislature in Canada has formally affirmed that these minority rights should specially be safeguarded by our constitution. By this reference we of the federal government and parliament have gone as far as we can go by ourselves in safeguarding these minority rights. But it must be obvious that in order to be completely effective the safeguards of these rights must be accepted by the provincial authorities and incorporated into a specially entrenched part of the constitution itself. For all of these reasons it followed logically that the next step in the process of working out a method of amending the constitution was to confer with the provinces.

Accordingly the Prime Minister invited the provincial Premiers to send a delegation to a Dominion-Provincial Conference at Ottawa on January 10th to ascertain whether an agreement would be reached upon the method by which our constitution could be amended within Canada as regards these matters of joint federal and provincial concern.

We made it clear at the outset we had not drawn up a cut and dried plan for amending the constitution that we wanted the provinces to rubber-stamp for us. On the contrary, we had deliberately come to the Conference without any preconceptions in this regard at all. In view of the provinces' great interest in these matters, we felt that any plan which emerged from the Conference had to be the product entirely of the Conference itself, and not the result of any pre-judgment of the issues by the Federal Government alone before the Conference started. We pointed out, however, that since any further constitutional amendment which the Conference might agree upon would have to be obtained from the British Parliament as a result of a joint Address presented by the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada, we would have to know what method of amendment the provinces would agree with us to suport, before we as a Government could secure from the Canadian Parliament and pass on to the British Parliament the joint Address which would be required in order to carry out such agreement. For that reason, we invited from the Provinces their ideas in this connection.

All that we said with regard to the method of amendment was that in our view it should meet three tests: First, it must preserve the federal character of the Canadian nation by preserving the autonomy of the Provincial Legislatures and of Parliament itself within their respective spheres; Second, it must have sufficient flexibility to enable Canada, with all the great human and natural resources of a dynamic nation, to develop unhampered by the rigid constitutional restrictions of a static nation; Third, it should protect minority rights absolutely.

Moreover, in order to remove all doubts we made it very clear at the outset of the Conference that the Federal Government was not seeking through the Conference to make any alteration at all in the existing distribution of powers. What we were asking the Provinces to consider was not what power the Dominion or the Provinces should have, but merely the manner or method of accomplishing any change in the distribution of powers which the changing needs of Canada might from time to time demonstrate to be necessary or desirable.

Moreover, we called this Conference with a very real desire to protect Provincial rights. As Premier McNair of New Brunswick pointed out in his opening speech at the Conference that:

> "No one would be sanguine enough to suppose that the voices of the Provinces would be heard at Westminster in protest against any amendment of the B.N.A. Act proposed by the Canadian Parliament! . . . If we should fail to impress our national legislators I conceive that the prospect of any protest having weight at Westminster would be most unlikely; in fact I believe the chances would be nil.
>
> "With these thoughts in mind I submit that the Provinces, at this stage in our constitutional development face this situation. First, in the matter of constitutional amendments, the Parliament of Canada is in effect the judge—and the sole judge—as to whether

provincial rights and privileges will be affected. Second, in consequence the only protection the Provinces have today against arbitrary invasion of their rights, powers and jurisdiction is the Parliament of Canada itself. Third, it is not inconceivable that some Canadian Parliament of the future might decide to request the Parliament of the United Kingdom to amend the constitution in most vital particulars affecting the Provinces and their autonomy, in utter defiance of them."

After making all allowances for any just difference of opinion, it is suggested that there is much food for thought in this quotation.

It is a source of very great gratification to all Canadians that the Conference was one of the most harmonious, the most successful and the most fruitful of any Dominion-Provincial Conference which has been held for many years. I was talking to an outstanding constitutional authority who had been in attendance at all of the Conferences for very many years, and he told me that he could not recall anything that matched it as far back as 1921. This was due, in my opinion, to the fact that the delegates, whether they represented the big provinces or the Federal Government, met as Canadians. The contributions made by your Ontario Premier and the Hon. Dana Porter, and by the Hon. Mr. Duplessis, who is his own Attorney-General, were very substantial, as indeed were those of all the Provincial representatives.

The Conference reached a certain important measure of agreement. It agreed:

(1) That in respect of those provisions of the British North America Act which concerned Parliament only, the amendment should be made by an Act of Parliament.

(2) That in respect of those provisions which concerned the Provincial Legislatures only, the amendment should be made by an Act of the Provincial Legislature.

(3) That in respect of those provisions which concern Parliament and one or more, but not all of the Provincial Legislatures, the amendment should be made by an Act of Parliament and an Act of the Legislature of each of the Provinces affected.

(4) In respect of provisions which concern Parliament and all of the Provincial Legislatures, the amendment should be made by an Act of Parliament of Canada and Acts of such majority of the Legislatures and upon such additional conditions, if any, as might be decided upon.

(5) That provisions concerning fundamental rights (as for instance, but without restriction, education, language, solemnization of marriage, administration of justice, provincial property in lands, mines and other natural resources) and the amendment of the amending procedures should be made by an Act of the Parliament of Canada and Acts of the Legislatures of all of the Provinces.

It was further agreed that the process of amendment in respect of the last three above-mentioned groups of provisions and also those which should be repealed entirely, should be capable of being initiated by one or more of the Provincial Legislatures or by the Parliament of Canada. It was also agreed that the subject of the delegation of powers should be placed upon the agenda of the Conference.

The Conference also agreed to the appointment of a continuing Sub-Committee of all of the Attorneys-General of the various Provinces under myself as Chairman. To this Committee will be submitted briefs of the various Provincial Governments expressing their views as to which of the above headings, each section of the British North America Act and other Canadian constitutional statutes, should be allocated. When all of these briefs shall have been submitted, it will be the task of this continuing Sub-Committee to endeavour to reconcile any conflict of opinion that there might be. The Committee will report any residual difference of opinion to the main Conference itself for consideration and further final adjustment by that body. This is the present standing of an important problem which presents one of the greatest tests that the political capacity of Canadian public men has had to face.

"IRON ORE DEPOSITS OF LABRADOR AND NEW QUEBEC"

An Address By

DR. JOSEPH ARLINGTON RETTY

Eminent Geologist

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, January 26th, 1950

Mr. Colebrook:

It is a privilege to have with us today, a man of action, who is contributing very substantially to Canada's wealth and importance in world affairs.—After a brilliant Academic Career, Dr. Retty, who had been studying geology and making surveys all over Canada, was appointed Chief Geologist to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company in 1936, a position which he has held to this day.

To him also, goes the credit for the discovery and the mapping of the Ilmenite area north of Havre St. Pierre, where large Titanium development is now progressing.

Dr. Retty is a member of:

Canadian Institute Mining and Metallurgy, American Institute Mining and Metallurgy, Fellow Geological Society of America, Fellow Geological Association of Canada, Fellow Arctic Institute of North America.

Dr. Retty's chosen subject is—"Iron Ore Deposits of Labrador and New Quebec."

It is with great pleasure that I introduce to you—Doctor Joseph Retty.

Dr. Retty:

The discovery of sizeable iron ore deposits in Labrador and New Quebec is undoubtedly one of the most outstanding mining developments of the twentieth century.

It is the culmination of a prospecting venture undertaken in 1936 and financed since 1942 by Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines Ltd. with The M. A. Hanna Company of Cleveland participating on a minority basis. These companies, through two subsidiaries, hold, for a limited period, 20,000 square miles in Labrador territory (Newfoundland) and 3,900 square miles in New Quebec (Ungava). Both areas must be reduced to a total of 1,300 square miles within 12 years.

The estimated reserve indicated to date by drilling in these areas is 356 million long tons, of which 242 million is in New Quebec and 114 million in Labrador. The ore is of good grade and 12 percent of the total carries some manganese.

The deposits lie along a northwest trending zone along a length of 90 miles. They are associated with extensive lean bands of iron formation of sedimentary origin of late Precambrian age. The iron ore discovered to date has all been developed from naturally exposed outcrop. The undiscovered potential concealed under the large unexplored, drift-covered areas is obviously great. But the search will be much more difficult and expensive henceforth.

The centre of the iron ore deposits is 320 miles north of Seven Islands, Quebec. The operation is unique in that it is serviced wholly by air. A landing strip has been constructed at Knob Lake in the interior and air transportation, with all modern facilities for instrument flying, is supplied by Hollinger Ungava Transport, a subsidiary of the mining companies.

There will be no major difficulty on railroad construction, although at some localities the terrain is difficult. The south terminus will be Seven Islands, Quebec, where there is an ideal deep water harbour. Ore docks will also be constructed at this point.

Power for the project will be furnished by Eaton Canyon, which lies close to the northernmost deposit. It has a potential of 500,000 horse-power. The rights to this site have been obtained by Ungava Power Co.

The mining companies have established an inland base at Burnt Creek with all modern conveniences, some ten miles west of the air strip. Approximately 100 miles of road have been constructed and 100,000 feet of drilling have been done. The overall cost of the project to date is $7,000,000. The total cost of all phases of the project is estimated at $200,000,000. Present plans call for an annual production of 10,000,000 tons of open-pit ore during a season which will last from 5½ to 6 months of the year.

The finances will henceforth be supplied by six United States steel companies which are participating with Hollinger in the "Iron Ore Company of Canada" which was recently formed for the purpose of bringing the area into production. The management will continue to be Hollinger-Hanna who have directed the project in the past.

On the basis of present needs, Canada could not possibly consume 10,000,000 tons of iron ore per year. If the project is to be undertaken with some assurance of financial success, American participation is a must in order to have the guaranteed markets that are essential to amortize the gigantic investment required for the project. The United States is not dependent on Canada for iron ore. As an alternative, it could be obtained from Liberia, Chile, Venezuela and Brazil, all of which have substantial reserves of excellent iron ore. Moreover, the beneficiation of low-grade ore (taconites) is quite within the realm of the probable and there are billions of tons of this type of material on the Mesabi range in Minnesota.

The present development will open up the vast mineral potential of this largely unexplored area and, at the same time, reserve an ample supply for Canadian steel mills if, as and when they require it.

What it will mean to the economy of this country is obvious. It will mean new towns, new railroads, new mines, new ships, new ancillary services, new markets. It will mean careers for thousands of Canadians from engineers, technicians and mechanics, to doctors, lawyers and above all labour, not to mention a welcome new source of scarce American dollars.

The story would be incomplete without a word of tribute to the vision and foresight of the men of Hollinger, such as Jules R. Timmins, President of the company, and to the men of Hanna, such as George M. Humphrey, President, who have been willing to risk the vast sums required for exploration and development of this new mining district which will mean so much to the economy of Canada.

Dr. Retty then projected on a screen an interesting collection of natural colour photographs taken in the Labrador iron fields.

"OUR ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM"

AN ADDRESS BY

HONOURABLE M. J. COLDWELL, M.P.

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, February 2nd, 1950

MR. HERMANT:

Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada: We are to hear an Address to-day by Mr. M. J. Coldwell, Member of Parliament for Rosetown-Biggar, Sask., the National President and Parliamentary Leader of the Co-Operative Commonwealth Federation Party. Born and educated in England, Mr. Coldwell came to Canada in 1910, and has from that time to this devoted himself to Canada and the Empire through conspicuous Public Service. As a Teacher, voluntary Lay Reader, Alderman, Hospital Governor, Member of Parliament, and Party Leader, Mr. Coldwell has made a fine contribution to this Country. He was a delegate to the Empire Parliamentary Conference in London in 1941, and again in 1948. He was a member of the official Canadian Delegation to the San Francisco Conference in 1945, and a Canadian delegate to the United Nations Assembly in New York. The Empire Club of Canada, whose motto is "Canada and a United Empire", has no Party politics, and while we do not all share the political convictions of our Guest to-day we do feel that with men of his character and goodwill devoting themselves unselfishly to Public Service along with the intelligent and active interest of all men of all political Parties our heritage of Political Freedom and British Justice is secure. It seems appropriate to quote the words of Winston Churchill when he was acknowledging Birthday Greetings from Prime Minister Attlee.

He said, "How far more great are all those sentiments which unite us than are the still quite important matters which are so often the occasion of debate". The subject of Mr. Coldwell's Address today is: "Our Economic Relations with the United Kingdom".

MR. COLDWELL:

No matter what the diversity of views may be regarding Canada's relationship with other commonwealth countries, a relationship which I believe the majority of the people are anxious to preserve, we must share grave misgivings concerning the economic problems which have arisen and which are crying aloud for solution.

The problems are those that affect Canada vitally, for, for almost a century, the Canadian economy has rested upon the assumption that we could find a market for our vast surpluses of food and many raw materials in the United Kingdom, while we could buy manufactured articles, raw cotton, citrus fruits and winter vegetable supplies from our great neighbour to the South.

We were able to do this because, prior to the two great wars, Great Britain had vast overseas resources from which she derived interest, or through such services as shipping, insurance, banking and so on, she was able to convert currencies she acquired into currencies she needed to purchase food and supplies in any parts of the world where they were available. So it was that she was able to purchase Canadian food and raw materials in vast quantities, in spite of the fact that we bought relatively little from her:

In other words—we were able to convert our sterling balances into dollars, or any other currencies we required, in order to get supplies we needed or desired from the United States and other countries, to which we sold far less than we bought from them.

And what was true of Canada was true, of course, of many other countries in the world because Britain was able to invest balances due her in assets from which she derived payment to her nationals, whether they were individuals or corporations.

To some extent Britain's overseas investments were liquidated during the first world war, but, in the second world war, not only were her assets largely liquidated and lost, but she accumulated debts, so that former debtor countries to her became her creditors.

This changed world situation had—and will I believe have—more particularly in the immediate future—a depressing effect on the Canadian economy.

We have, as I said in the House of Commons several years ago, a more vulnerable economy than almost any of the great trading countries because of the historic manner in which our economy has been built on the basis of triangular trade with the United States on the one hand, and the United Kingdom on the other.

Since the war one school of thought in Canada has promoted the idea that our future welfare lay in the direction of increasing our trade with the United States.

Unfortunately, in many respects, the main commodities upon which a large proportion of people depend, are competitive with United States producers.

If we take the number of people who are employed in a particular industry as the criterion, we shall find that agriculture is the industry upon which the largest number of Canadian citizens depend directly or indirectly, for their welfare and their prosperity.

It is this industry which is almost entirely dependent upon the United Kingdom market.

During the war our agricultural production was greatly expanded, particularly in certain aspects. We became the principal suppliers not only of wheat but of bacon, eggs, and other agricultural commodities.

This was made possible by the credits or gifts established for Britain and by the liquidation of assets formerly held by British nationals, in Canadian railways and other industries.

At the end of the war the British people faced a stupendous economic problem. They continued—and indeed increased—the austerity programme that had been inaugurated during the war.

They began not only to repair internal war damage in housing and in factories, but to replace obsolete machinery and build new industries in depressed areas to increase their production and their output.

Those of us who have followed the heroic attempt to rebuild the British economy have been deeply impressed with the success already attained. What is sometimes forgotten is that Marshall Aid received by the United Kingdom, has been almost entirely offset by British aid to India, Pakistan, Egypt, and indeed other countries including Western Germany.

This now is certain, that in the immediate future—and I expect for a number of years, Britain will have to buy where she can sell; in other words, obtain the necessary funds to purchase her supplies where she is able to send her goods or perform her services to obtain the necessary funds.

It will be seen, then, that Canadians must revise their views and trade policies, to meet a new situation.

Let me repeat what I have already said—that the prosperity of Canada, as a nation, is not only closely, but inextricably, linked with the United Kingdom economy. Without that market for our vast surpluses of wheat, apples and other primary produce, our economy will be seriously depressed.

Those who have contended that we must find markets for Canadian goods in the United States must have been disillusioned recently—when our great neighbour to the South declared surplus, or put floor prices (which have the same effect) under nearly all agricultural products which we export in large quantities.

These include, of course, grains, bacon, pork, eggs, potatoes, and so on, all of which we have in surplus supply also.

Only those primary commodities derived from resources which the American people have exploited in the past, are now welcome in quantity in the United States.

These include forest products, iron ore and other minerals. Unlike agricultural products, once they are used they are not quickly replaced, and, in the end, their export may retard the development of our economy in the future.

Canada's relationship, then, economically, with the United Kingdom, is essential to the welfare of the present population of Canada, and, I believe, to the wellbeing of this nation in the years to come.

What then are the steps we must take to offset the difficulties that have arisen? Some, of course, are domestic and some international.

It seems to me that there are three primary steps which must be undertaken at government level:

First, and most important,—domestic consumption must be maintained and increased by planning for full employment and widely distributed purchasing power. This, however, to a great extent, depends upon the other two policies which seem to me to be necessary.

If we are to maintain our domestic economy at a reasonable level, the government cannot allow primary products to fall drastically in price.

Consequently, the maintenance of purchasing power on our farms and in our forest industries, may require the establishment of what we now call—floor prices.

This, however, is outside the scope of my address today.

The Third policy which comes under the head of my topic, is the necessity of Canada taking the initiative both at home and abroad to restore order in the realm of international marketing.

As I have already indicated, throughout the years our best and most reliable overseas market for exportable surplus has been the United Kingdom.

Obviously, at no time in their history, did they need to import food from Canada to a greater extent than at the present time. Their problem—and indeed our problem too—is to find ways and means of adjusting payments between us.

They have made and are making unusual attempts to find markets in Canada for goods that we can use. Their methods may be faulty, but these, I am glad to say, are something which groups of Canadian importers and United Kingdom exporters are endeavouring to improve.

I believe that the situation is far from hopeless and that solutions can be found. Undoubtedly, one of the principal barriers against the importation of British and sterling area goods is our Canadian tariff structure. If Canadian tariffs were lower, the United Kingdom could ship us more goods in payment for the primary products we have to sell.

But, unfortunately, instead of lowering tariffs against British imports since the end of the war, we have in several important instances raised them. When our government signed the Geneva Agreements just over two years ago, we accepted immediately the non-discriminatory features of the undertaking. That we need not have done in view of our trade position until at least one year later, and if, as it hapepned, the dollar sterling situation remained as it was, we could have obtained a further postponement of the coming into effect of the non-discriminatory clauses of the Agreement.

But, are the Canadian Government and the Canadian industrialists anxious to encourage British imports? One is inclined to doubt it when, for example, important expenditures by government-owned organizations are made in the United States for equipment that could be bought cheaper from the United Kingdom.

A recent example is the purchase by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of equipment for television transmission in the United States without permitting the British who are, we are told, more advanced in television, to tender on the equipment. Examples of the same sort of thing have been appearing in American newspapers, reporting that contracts for electrical and other equipment obtainable in Britain at lower prices have been given to United States firms.

We are preaching to the British to increase their exports; we should practice what we preach by importing supplies and equipment which we can obtain economically from them.

Then in his 1948 budget speech the Minister of Finance announced that on July 1, 1949, the pre-war tariffs against British cotton and rayon piece-goods would be reimposed.

This was a sore blow to the British government which relies to a considerable extent upon the export of textiles to obtain necessary funds abroad, with which to buy food, raw materials and other supplies.

But the British were not slow in pointing out that the policies being pursued by Canada in these particulars were a very serious consequence.

There is no doubt that many of the goods which we are importing from the United States, we could get just as well, if not in some respects, better, from the United Kingdom.

We cannot expect under present circumstances to continue to sell to Britain three dollars worth of Canadian commodities for every dollar's worth of goods we accept in return.

I do not mean to imply that there can be a complete or absolute balance between our two countries therefore, it would, I believe, help to bridge the immediate gap if we accepted part-payment in sterling. It is improbable that this could happen under the present circumstances or any likely to arise in the near future.

That being the case some other method must be found of reconciling our accounts. Because of our habit of purchasing large quantities of goods in the United States, our policy has been geared to obtain dollars in payment for goods we exported to the United Kingdom and to other countries.

Instead of demanding payment in dollars, therefore, it would, I believe, help to bridge the immediate gap if we accepted part-payment in sterling.

This sterling could be used to buy some of the goods we shall need in the future from Britain's ever-increasing production, but what is much more feasible and important, it could also be used for Canadian investment in the sterling area.

The countries of South East Asia and the under-developed areas of Africa, controlled as they are by sterling area countries—and particularly by the United Kingdom—are trying to build up and expand their economies. They need machinery of all kinds. There is, therefore, no reason why Canada could not export to Britain foodstuffs and other commodities which we have in surplus supply to feed or house the British workers who would produce many of the machines needed in the under-developed areas.

Thus payment to Canada could be made in the form of capital investment in the under-developed areas. In this way each country could specialize in the kind of production for which it is best suited and at the same time help to build up the under-developed areas of the world.

Thus we would assist the British people to obtain badly needed food and other supplies and at the same time assure Canadian producers of badly needed markets for the vast surpluses which otherwise will accumulate and be a burden to our economy. Not only will it be a burden to our economy but it will inevitably lead to drastic curtailment of purchasing power on our farms and to unemployment in our cities.

A plan of the description such as I have suggested, would not only be beneficial to Canadian economy but would secure for us the goodwill of old and new territories containing millions of potential customers for Canadian supplies.

You will, therefore, see that the proposal I am making does not involve the accumulation of frozen sterling balances which one day Britain or other countries in the sterling area would have to redeem in dollars. If that were so, the proposal would be unacceptable to the British, whose spokesman, Mr. Harold Wilson, at the Food and Agricultural Conference last year stated—and I quote from his official text—"the accumulation of large and growing amounts of inconvertible currency on the assumption that they would one day be made convertible" was a policy which he could not accept.

What I am suggesting is that sterling accepted as part-payment for Canadian exports should be used for investment purposes in the sterling area, or for payment for goods to be delivered as production increases in Britain.

This latter proposal would, of course, not be practicable if there were no prospect of increased production in the United Kingdom, but production has been rising steadily as war damage has been repaired and will continue to rise as results of the present heavy capital expenditures in the country become apparent. This, however, is only one, and not the principal, part of my proposal.

British and American economists all agree that any attempt to bridge the dollar gap must include not only action to increase North American purchases of sterling goods but also to increase the flow of investment from North America to sterling areas, and more particularly to the under-developed regions of the sterling area. This point is too often ignored in a discussion of the subject in Canada, although, as I have already indicated, every responsible study of the situation has underlined its importance.

Last September the Washington Conference stressed the need for both public and private investments from the dollar area to the sterling area.

Quite recently at the meeting of the Commonwealth Foreign Ministers in Ceylon, this phase of our commonwealth relationships was underlined.

Indeed in the speech to which I have already referred, that of Mr. Harold Wilson, last September, the importance of international investment by Canada and the United States was emphasized, and I quote—"since it is one of the most hopeful and speediest means of increasing the flow of scarce currencies into the rest of the world."

Hence the suggestion I have made with respect to sterling balances being used for investment purposes is directly in line with the suggestions.

Let me emphasize that the United Kingdom is much better equipped than Canada to provide many types of capital goods required in other parts of the sterling area.

The Canadian economy, on the other hand, has been largely built on the provision of vast quantities of wheat and other food products, as well as other kinds of raw material for export abroad. Hence, part of Canada's contribution to the proposed flow of investment to the underdeveloped regions of the sterling area might well be the supplying of food, for example, to the British workers who are producing some of the needed capital goods.

The development of such arrangements would, of course, require agreement among the countries concerned, but what I am doing is trying to suggest some basis of discussion to enable us to maintain those economic relationships upon which I firmly believe the welfare and prosperity of our own country depends.

This is not a plea for aid to Britain. That is, if I may use a term which I hope you will not misunderstand, an incidental consideration to a Canadian interested in the welfare of his own country primarily. I believe, however, that if a solution along these lines can be worked out, it would be helpful both to the British people and would assure Canadian primary producers of badly needed markets.

One other point I think I should make is that I am not suggesting that the purchase of United States goods should be denied to Canadians. I suggest nothing of the kind.

I do suggest that our balance of payments to the United States is, under present world conditions, a burden which is becoming ever more difficult for Canada to bear. I suggest that there are some Canadian expenditures for United States products which could be curtailed without causing very much hardship to the Canadian public.

Then, of course, we could further restrict luxury travel to the United States. In November, 1947, the federal government imposed limited restrictions against imports from the United States.

In the year 1948, Canadian imports of restricted goods from the United States were approximately three hundred million dollars less than in 1947.

Even more substantial savings could have been made if our imports of alcoholic beverages, of raw furs and luxury goods had been curtailed—indeed these might have been substituted for some of the more essential things, like fresh winter vegetables, and thus removed some of the causes of dissatisfaction which the policy involved.

Of course I know that the objection to what I am suggesting is that such a policy involves certain government controls.

That is, of course, true, but if the choice has to be made between the institution of certain controls and a drastic reduction in farm purchasing power and an increase in unemployment, I believe the Canadian people would prefer intelligent and beneficial controls.

Canada's prosperity in the future as in the past, depends, in my opinion, upon our ability to trade as freely as we can with our best customer—the United Kingdom.

In so many respects our economy is competitive with that of United States. It is in the same respects complementary to that of the United Kingdom.

Apart altogether from sentiment, from the desirability of maintaining our commonwealth associations, our material and economic interests lie in maintaining and expanding our relationships with the United Kingdom.

To assume the maintenance and, indeed, the expansion of this vital economic relationship, must be, I believe, a primary purpose of public policy.

"STALIN'S BIGGEST HEADACHE"

AN ADDRESS BY

WILLSON WOODSIDE, B.Sc.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR, SATURDAY NIGHT

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, February 9th., 1950

MR. HERMANT:

Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada: Our Guest Speaker to-day is a fellow Torontonian and an old friend of this Club. We all know, like and respect Willson Woodside. A Graduate, and a former member of the Staff, of the University of Toronto, Associate-Editor of Saturday Night, and Special Commentator on the C.B.C., he is a valued member of this Community. Father of 5 children. He has done much to keep us in touch with International affairs, and has been an Ambassador of goodwill and understanding from Canada to the rest of the World. An Engineer by profession Willson Woodside used to spend his summer vacations touring Industrial plants in Europe. He soon learned to appreciate the inescapable connection between Industrial and Political activity there, and his keen acquisitive mind and natural flair for writing and self-expression, soon won him an outstanding reputation as a Political analyst. Those of us who have had the pleasure of hearing Willson Woodside address this Club, who have heard his Broadcasts, and who read his Articles in Saturday Night, will give ready testimony to the fact that he is the exception that proves the rule that a man is rarely a prophet in his own country. For corroboration I would refer you to the Empire Club Year Books of 1946 and 1947 where you will find recorded Mr. Woodside's addresses to the Club on Russia and Spain. His words at that time were interesting and prophetic. In the interim some changes have taken place. The format of

Saturday Night has been changed, as has the wave length of the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. Political changes have taken place in Europe also, but Willson Woodside has remained the same, a keen observer and an accurate and interesting reporter. It is our privilege to hear him this afternoon address us on the subject: "Stalin's Biggest Headache".

MR. WOODSIDE:

Mr. President, Guests and Members: Mr. Hermant's kind remarks about my family recalls a comment I heard once about the man who had five children being better satisfied than the man with 5 million dollars. The man with 5 million dollars still wants more!

In spite of this great effort, I don't feel old, or even middle-aged, and yet I was thinking this morning that it is now close on to sixteen years since I made my first talk to the Empire Club. It was my first big public speech—and was a very bad talk too,—and I think it is a remarkable thing that you ever asked me back.

"Stalin's Biggest Headache", to which I am referring, is not the Hydrogen bomb. How he feels about that I am not informed, though I fancy that humanitarians on our side are much more worried about it than he is.

Nor am I referring to his troubles with "the Mao who came to dinner", and has stayed on nearly two months in the Kremlin, though this may also lead to a headache.

The headache I am referring to is TITOISM—and I have no doubt it is a headache, the biggest headache that Stalin has had since Trotsky's day. I admit, though you may think me callous, that I have enjoyed listening to the screams of pain over the Moscow Radio, almost every day for a year and a half.

I hope none of you have missed this pleasure—one of few since the end of the war—through any suspicion that Tito's defiance is all a fake. I was talking only last night to an intelligent woman who was quite convinced that this was one of the greatest put-up jobs in history. It isn't. Titoism is a very serious heresy in the world church of Communism.

Only last week, for example, I saw in the transcript of the Moscow Radio which I am fortunate enough to receive each day, that Moscow is saying that Titoism is the "greatest menace to 'progressive'—meaning 'Communist'—forces in South America which exists today." The Soviets themselves are in fact the best authorities for my claim that Titoism is a serious challenge to Moscow's leadership.

Titoism has revealed, in a striking way, the weaknesses of the new Muscovite imperialism—though I may say that it was not Tito, among the Soviet neighbors, who first discovered this imperialism. I recall vividly an evening spent with my good friend, Jan Masaryk, in London during the war, just after he had returned from Moscow negotiating a treaty of friendship. He was convinced then that the Soviets "had gone completely imperialist."

He told me that in his weekly broadcast to his people he was referring—this was in 1944—only to "the Soviet Empire" and not the Soviet Union, to give them some warning as to what to expect after the war. This did not earn Moscow's approval and affection. He died suddenly, as you know, two years ago—and however this happened, people in Czechoslovakia are convinced he was done in.

Because Tito was one jump further away from the U.S.S.R., and had a window on the free world, he and the Yugoslavs have been able to express their national sentiment in the breakaway from the absolute dictation of the Kremlin. This does not mean that Tito is not a Communist. As someone put it well, *he is no less Communist than the Bolsheviks, but more Yugoslav than the Russians*. But of course, from being propagandized as the second greatest hero of world communism, he is now denounced by Moscow as a "Gestapo spy, a Judas, a running-dog of American imperialism."

There are other peoples who, like the Ukrainians and Balts, have not had the same opportunity to break away; still others like the Poles and Czechs, the Hungarians, Rumanians and Bulgarians who would find it much more difficult. But I have no doubt that they feel basically the same way as the Yugoslavs—for Yugoslav nationalism is no stronger than most of these others.

The success of Titoism now becomes a powerful incentive and encouragement to these other subjugated peoples to continue the struggle and seek their time. It also provides a dramatic warning to other nations still beyond Soviet control, who have swallowed the propaganda about Stalin's great international "liberating" movement, the "hope" of the workers of the world. They can hear what the Yugoslavs, who had a close look at "paradise", have to say about it.

And don't think that these others—Communists and non-Communists—are not listening in on what Tito has to say about complete subjugation which Moscow demands of her supposed "junior partners" in the "people's democratic front."

The Yugoslav Communist leaders, anxious to prove that they are real upholders of the Leninist tradition, have assiduously distributed the correspondence with Stalin which preceded the break. They gave this out in English and it is a fascinating document. Large quantities have been uncovered in Germany, printed in German. It has been sent into Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria.

Titoism has completely split the Norwegian Communist party. The powerful French Communist Party has a Titoist purge under way. The leader of the Japanese Communist Party, an old comrade of the Chinese leader Mao, has been denounced from Moscow as a Titoist—but upheld by his own following.

To check Titoism in Bulgaria, the Soviets have liquidated most of the native Communist leaders and installed men long-trained in Moscow. Here and in Hungary they have held Titoist show trials of top figures, and they are preparing such a trial in Poland. The men being tried and liquidated are figures who were chosen just over two years ago as the most reliable and able Communists in the satellites, to launch the Cominform. So deeply has Titoism eaten into Communist loyalty.

Now what, exactly, is meant by Titoism? The answer has been given over and over by Tito: it is an assertion that Communist countries, while cooperating in a "Socialist brotherhood', are equal, and must have the right to run their own house, according to their own special conditions and traditions. It is a flat denial of Moscow's right to dictate every aspect of domestic and foreign policy.

What Tito has said about Soviet policy, in asserting his independence, must I believe dispel any notion that the whole quarrel is a subtle trick. It is altogether too damaging to Moscow and to Stalin.

Tito has said that the Soviet Union has abandoned Leninism. He has said the Soviet Union is degenerate; that it suppresses all truth, wallows in lies, and has lost all moral foundation. You can hear all this in his broadcasts from Belgrade.

Tito has proclaimed that *Stalin is not always right*—which is the supreme heresy.

He says that Soviet Communism has become just another imperialism. He has quoted chapter and verse of its exploitation of Yugoslavia, and has attempted to keep it a colony supplying raw materials. He says the Soviets paid low prices for these, and demanded high prices for goods sent in exchange—goods they often had extorted cheaply from Poland or Czechoslovakia. They imposed joint stock companies on Yugoslavia, as on the other satellites, in which they held half of the stock, provided a very small part of the capital, but took most of the production.

On the political side, Tito has revealed that the Soviets spied on everything that was done in Yugoslavia, maintaining their own special secret service there just as they do in Canada and all other countries.

They had "trusties" inside the Yugoslav Politburo, reporting every detail of what was discussed, every difference of opinion, every remark critical of Soviet policy. They were prepared to use these agents to replace Tito and his lieutenants—but he grabbed them first. We may assume the Soviets use the same system to control the other satellite governments.

We may be sure that the damaging effects of Tito's inside story of Soviet methods have been far more apparent to the Soviet rulers than to the rest of us. His defiance came at a moment when they were clamping down the blockade on Berlin, no doubt as a preliminary to far-reaching policies in Europe, hopes for which must have been encouraged by the strength and activity of the Communist Parties in France and Italy at that time.

If, as one may suppose, they hoped to gain control of all Germany at that time—and this remains their supreme objective—then Tito helped to upset their plans. They have had to turn to an intensive effort to consolidate their hold over the other satellites, and put down Tito's insubordination.

It may even be that the experience with Tito will move the Soviets to incorporate the other satellites within the U.S.S.R. sooner than they had intended. Rokossovsky's appointment as virtual viceroy of the Kremlin in Poland may, in fact, be the first step towards incorporation. There is said to be a Soviet general placed over the Bulgarian Army, under a false name, and there have been rumours of similar moves in other satellites.

If you consider the Soviet mentality, and the way they have dealt with their own people during the past thirty years, how would they go about making sure that no more satellites break away? The certain method is to place them within the iron-bound Soviet frontier; to bring them under the full control of the N.K.V.D.; to move their armies to other parts of the U.S.S.R. or water them down with Russian troops: to deal with them, in short, exactly as they have dealt with the Ukrainians, the Georgians and the White Russians and other peoples of the U.S.S.R. since the Revolution.

How else can they really consolidate their control over Central and Eastern Europe, as Western Europe recovers, strengthens its military and economic power, and exerts a stronger and stronger pull on the satellites, where everything is getting worse, sinking to the Soviet level of life?

I think we can take it for granted that the Soviet leaders realize that had the Czechs and Yugoslavs concerted their policy early last year, before Czechoslovakia was taken over completely by the Communists, and when Tito was beginning to show defiance, an independence movement might have spread through all the satellite countries. It may have been Tito's growing independence at that time which hastened the seizure of government in Czechoslovakia, causing a profound shock throughout the Western world, and bringing on all these movements towards unity: Western Union, Consolidation of Europe and the Atlantic Pact.

It would seem therefore that that move in Czechoslovakia was a costly policy for the Soviet Union, in spurring the West towards unity and rearmament.

The incorporation of the satellite states within the new Soviet Empire would have an even more profound effect in the West. Among all the opponents of Soviet imperialism it would further spur movements towards unity and strength. Among all those sympathetic to the Soviet cause, it would make an end to all pretence that Soviet Communism was an international workers' movement. It would confirm all that Tito is saying about it having degenerated into imperialism.

Now why, if Titoism is so damaging, have the Soviets not done away with Tito and his following before this? Well, they have tried to. At first they seem to have been over-confident that he just couldn't defy them, that the bulk of the Yugoslav Communists were loyal to Moscow and with proper help and encouragement would overthrow him.

I heard in Washington last year a very interesting story from a man who was Hungarian Finance Minister up to the time of Tito's defection. He remarked to the leading Communist and Prime Minister of Hungary, Rakosi, that he intended to go for a holiday to the Dalmatian Coast. Rakosi impressed on him that he should not go to the Dalmatian Coast at the present time. After Tito's defiance, Rakosi said to him, "Now you know what I meant. However, I think that in about six weeks time you can take your trip to the Dalmatian Coast." So it was believed in inner Communist circles that Tito would last six weeks!

When this hope faded, the Soviets clamped on a severe economic blockade, which they thought would bring Tito down. Economic help from the West has saved Tito from that. He also seems to have found more support from his people, in defying Moscow, than he had ever gained in serving Moscow. I doubt if even one-fourth of the Yugoslavs would vote for Tito in different circumstances, but they prefer him to a new viceroy sent in by the Kremlin, which is the choice they have at the present.

Doubtless the Soviets have tried to assassinate Tito. And they have organized groups of Yugoslav Communists in the satellites neighboring on Yugoslavia, to carry on broadcasting and publish and smuggle in propaganda against Tito—probably with the promise that these men would get good jobs after the victory.

But Tito knows all the tricks. He was raised in their school. I have heard that he has night-fighter patrols watching for the parachuting of Soviet agents—as was done in wartime. And his security arrangements have successfully safeguarded his person.

That brings in a rather nice story quoted by an American who interviewed Tito last fall and asked him, what exactly was his policy? Tito leaned back and said, with a grin, "My policy is to keep alive!"

There are very many who believe that Stalin is bound now to use military force to make an end to Tito's defiance. Certainly he has used, and will use, threat of force. The mobilization last fall in Rumania and Hungary, along the Yugoslav border, was too well advertised, however, to be the real thing. It didn't shake Tito.

Since then, I have had reports of a steady building-up of Soviet troops in Hungary, of the development of bigger air bases, the pushing through of the double-track Russian wide-gauge railroad lines to Budapest—and also to Bucharest in Rumania, and to Breslau, on the Oder, facing Eastern Germany.

So I think that, all in all, there is every indication that a big crisis will arise in the Balkans and Central Europe in the spring. Will Stalin actually send the Soviet Army into Yugoslavia? Only if he is convinced that the Western powers would not become involved, and a general war develop. Without *our* atom bombs, one can imagine the kind of ultimatum he would deliver, using the threat of *his* atom bombs.

We can't say for sure Stalin will continue to follow a cautious course. But he has a record of caution. We know that in Greece, Trieste and Berlin, he has been cautious in avoiding a final showdown. And the movement of sufficient troops to make a quick job of Yugoslavia would be almost sure to bring on a general war scare.

Will Stalin then try to bring down Tito with a guerilla campaign on a far larger scale than that in Greece? The first bands of Bulgarian guerillas have already been caught in Yugoslavia, and are even now on trial. But it would take a very big guerilla campaign to subdue the Yugoslav Army, trained in such warfare—especially if the guerillas were well-hated Bulgarians and Hungarians. And such a campaign would drag out, giving Tito time to get supplies through his window on the Mediterranean, also giving time for a general war crisis to develop.

So one returns to the alternative of incorporating the neighboring satellites in U.S.S.R., which would move the vast Soviet military power right up to the Yugoslav border. Stalin may well believe that Tito could not withstand such pressure for long.

We have been talking up to now about what Stalin may do about Tito. Now we come to the question of what *we* will do, ought to do, about him. That is a difficult question. Tito is against Stalin. His defiance is weakening Stalin's position and propaganda. Stalin is Enemy No. 1. So we may well reason that what is bad for Stalin is good for us, and that we should help Tito.

This seems to be a sound and realistic policy, *so long as we keep our minds clear on what we are trying to achieve.* Tito is a Communist—he claims to be the real Communist leader. He maintains a sterner tyranny than the other satellite leaders. We must somehow make it clear to the Yugoslav people that our ultimate aim is the securing of their freedom, and that we are supporting Tito only against Moscow and not against them.

Therefore we must impose conditions on our aid to Tito. He needs us: there is no future for him in the Soviet system, only the biggest show trial in history and a slow and painful death. Let's hear no nonsense about his not accepting any conditions for our aid. That's the sort of thing we let Stalin put over on us, when we pumped in supplies to him while his back was to the wall, without at least getting his signature on a document which we could show the world and distribute among his oppressed people, promising the abolition of slave labor in the U.S.S.R. and freedom for the Eastern European peoples whom he was supposed to be "liberating" from Hitler.

Instead he cleverly put us in the position of appearing to be supporting him, thus discouraging the hopes of freedom burning strongly at that time among many of his peoples, and notably the Ukrainians.

I had in my office just a few weeks ago a fine figure of a guerilla fighter, who had fought his way from the Ukraine across Czechoslovakia to Germany, and thence to Canada, to contact the Ukrainians on this continent. He told of fighting going on in the woods with guerrilla detachments 1,000 strong, even last year. The Ukrainian underground movement, he claimed, reached its maximum strength as late as January, 1947. Gradually the

Soviet troops and secret police are getting them under control.

Stalin even got us to promise to deliver back to his executioners and his labor camp supervisors all those Soviet citizens who had fled the U.S.S.R., or been carried off by the Germans during the war, and didn't want to go back. That, to my mind, was the absolute low point in all our policy towards the Soviet Union. It may now take us years to convince those of Stalin's people who are striving for freedom that we are on their side, and not on his.

We must at all costs avoid that mistake in dealing with Tito—and with General Franco.

The least we could demand of Tito, surely, is that he must give up at once the 8000 kidnapped Greek children he is still holding; and abolish his forced labor practices. I think we should also stipulate that, after his present crisis passes, he will allow free political activity and an opposition free press.

He may not keep his promise—and if he is an unredeemed scoundrel, he will calculate on that when he gives it. But at least our record, and our moral position, would be clear. We could hold his promise before his people, and that would constitute a steady pressure on him. If he should come to recognize the basic errors and evil of Communism, as former Communists like Koestler and Silone, Kravchenko and Gouzenko, have done, we should have helped to gain freedom for another people.

When I talk about freedom, I am inclined to lose my calm. I believe, passionately, that the idea of freedom offers us an explosive more powerful than the atomic bomb or the hydrogen bomb, to blow up the empire of this modern Genghis Khan.

I believe that, only if we believe deeply enough in the idea of freedom, only if we can rise above the enervating comfort and illusive security which we feel on this continent, and go to work vigorously to pry away at the weak joints of the Soviet tyranny, are we likely to make it the triumphant force in the world.

I would like to see us launch a real cold war of ideas, a democratic counter-offensive, against Stalin's spreading Communist imperialism. I would aid the Ukrainians and the Baltic peoples, whose partisans are still fighting in the woods, the other subjugated peoples of the Soviet Union, who showed their restlessness during the war, and the satellite peoples with their strong nationalist feelings, with all the apparatus of the wartime resistance movements.

I would support them in setting up National Committees of Liberation, supported by Canadian, British and American Friends of the Russian people, Friends of the Ukrainian people, of the Polish and Hungarian people, and so on.

I would encourage Committees of Polish Trade Unionists-in-exile. Czech Trade Unionists, Ukrainians Balts, and so on.

I would support the existing committees of notable exiles: the Committee for a Free Europe, the Eastern European Peasant Union.

I would use pamphlets, underground newspapers, stronger radio programs, agents to contact their underground organization.

I would work on Soviet troops on occupation duty—so many of whom have come over, even without assurance against being handed back to Stalin.

I would work through the Orthodox Church in the satellites, into the Orthodox Church in Soviet Union.

In short, I would turn the cold war on Stalin, keep him busy, put him on the defensive.

The ideas which can do this are freedom and union. A solemn promise of self-determination for all peoples, and a clear plan for a United Europe.

I believe only this kind of war, and not a war of atom-bombs, will give the possibility of establishing a real and manageable peace.

I have some hope, from the speech with which Senator Brien McMahon stirred the U.S. Senate the other day as it has not been stirred for years, urging a great world-wide peace offensive, that we may be on the verge of launching something like this.

We had better not waste much more time. For never in all history did the clock tick away the hours and the days and the months so fatefully as it is doing right now.

"SCOUTS TODAY—MEN TOMORROW"

An Address By

MAJOR-GENERAL D. C. SPRY, C.B.E., D.S.O.

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, February 16th, 1950

Mr. Colebrook:

Honoured Guests and Members: We have with us today a man with a very brilliant military career.

In December, 1939, Captain Spry went overseas. He was promoted to Major in 1940. In September, 1941, he was appointed to Headquarters of the First Canadian Division. In 1942 we find him working on plans for the invasion of the Continent at General Headquarters of the British Home Forces—later being named Personal Assistant to General McNaughton. During the Sicilian campaign on the death of the Commander of his old regiment—The Royal Canadians—he was appointed to its command.

In 1943 he was promoted to Brigadier and awarded the D.S.O., for brilliant leadership of the First Canadian Infantry Brigade in the Pontecorvo region. Honoured by The King with the C.B.E.

He was promoted to Major General at the age of 31.

You will agree, I am sure, that a man with such a record was a very happy choice for the position of Chief Executive Commissioner of the Boy Scouts Association: and I will now call upon Major-General Spry, C.B.E., D.S.O., who has chosen as his subject:

"SCOUTS TODAY—MEN TOMORROW"

Major-General Spry:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dodington, Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada: I consider it a very great honour to be invited again to address the Empire Club of Canada. I find this is the third time that I have been so honoured.

I am especially delighted that you have given me this opportunity of speaking to you at this particular time, because I would like to draw attention to the activities of the Boy Scouts Association, as we are asking the public of Canada to lend a hand financially in the further expansion and development of this great movement.

There is no need to tell an educated audience such as this, what Scouting is trying to do. Anyone who considers himself aware and informed certainly knows the aims and intentions of this tremendous movement, a movement which has grown from an idea in a man's mind to one of the largest, uniformed, but non-military bodies in the world—some 5 million of us today, and in Canada about 110,000 men and boys.

In brief, these leaders are endeavouring to train these boys to be the sort of neighbours you and I want to have around us.

Now, in the face of the political hazards of the day, in the face of alphabetical bombs, and at least economic mists, man is searching.—I think in his dilemma man is searching for three important things.

The first is FAITH : faith in some power greater than himself, a faith which will give him the spiritual strength to face changing conditions, over which he himself appears to have little control. It is in this search for faith that the Scout movement lends a hand. Every member of the Boy Scouts Association, man and boy, is required to do his best to live by a promise which is primarily to do one's duty to God. No one can be an active member of this Association without subscribing to that promise.

The second thing which man is searching for is some degree of STABILITY in his social contacts. He is trying to find some stability in his relationships, perhaps with his family, with his employer or employees, with his friends, in his neighbourhood, in his city and community. Scouting lends a hand in the development of the boy, to be the sort of man who will enjoy some degree of social stability, because the Scout method of training develops the boy mentally, so that he is capable of living with others; he learns to give and take at a young age, so that he is capable of withstanding the mental shocks, the mental kicks on the shins, which he doubtless will get in the world of politics and business.

The third thing which man is searching for is some power of RESILIENCY: resiliency within himself, to change his way of living, to change his thoughts and methods of thinking, to change even some of his beliefs, because he is going to have to change whether he likes it or not. We are in a period of change.

In the face of all these changes and frustrations, it is only the resilient man who can bend himself to changing conditions; and so I suggest to you that these three things are amongst the important things which many of us search for—Faith in some power greater than ourselves; some Stability in our social contacts, and Resilience in our ability to cope with changing conditions.

Scouting provides a multitude of activities which give the boy some experience, some background, some training for this sort of search. I would like to give you a few examples.

This past summer we held for the first time a Canadian National Boy Scout Jamboree just outside of Ottawa. There we brought together just short of 3,000 young boys from every part of Canada, and a representative group from the United States. I think that Jamboree did a tremendous job of debunking three Canadian myths. We have always been told that three obstacles to Canadian unity were religious differences, language differences and geography, or time and space.

Let us see how this group of 3,000 boys debunked those three myths. At this Jamboree we had, I think it was twelve different denominations and faiths, and yet there were no incidents or unpleasantnesses. There were many incidents of boys showing considerable repect for the faiths and religious persuasions of others. An example: On one Sunday there was a church service going on in one of the buildings and a group of boys coming away from another religious service, were laughing and shouting as boys will, until they came alongside this building. They realized that there was a church service going on, and right away I noticed that this rollicking group of boys became silent; they walked past with dignity and with respect for other people's feelings. It was just one of the examples I saw of boys growing up with some degree of tolerance for other people's beliefs.

Language proved no barrier, and yet we are told this is one of the obstacles to Canadian unity. It was not many days before boys were jabbering away in English and French, and a little Spanish because we had a small group of Cuban boys—and language, instead of a barrier, became a bridge bringing boys together. They swapped belts and neckerchiefs in English, French and Spanish.

And the third point—Geography—we have always been told it is difficult for Canadians in the East to know much of the Canadians in the West because of time and space, because of cost of travel. These boys debunked that, by co-operation. This was brought about by pooling transportation costs. The boys of Ontario and Quebec threw a few extra dollars into the transportation pot to enable boys to come from Halifax and the West for the same price as the boy from near Ottawa. In other words, co-operation overcame time and space and money, and those boys set a lesson for their adults and presumably betters.

I saw another example of what Scouting can do in Norway last August. I was one of the three Canadian delegates to the World Scout Conference. When I saw this motley crew gathered together in the first session of the Conference, I wondered how it would be possible to achieve any degree of understanding and agreement amongst such a mixed lot. Yet by the end of the first day we were calling each other by our first names. By the end of the Conference, in spite of the number of very controversial matters on the agenda complete understanding was achieved. The Resolutions Committee tabled their report at the last session, which I unfortunately had to Chair. That Resolutions Committee report was adopted unanimously by 140 men representing 41 countries,—unanimously adopted, in spite of the variety of background, educational standards, different languages and faiths, different colors, different standards of Scout experience. Unanimity was brought about by the fact that all of us approached these problems with a community of interest. . . . A community of interest based upon Scout experience, the Scout law and promise. That was the meeting ground on which we built understanding.

I shall never forget the last closing moments of that Conference, when these 140 men from 41 countries stood up and reaffirmed the Scout promise in their own language. I have never heard such an extraordinary sound in my life. I heard the Scout promise—

> "On my honour, I promise that I will do my best, to do my duty to God and the King, to help other people at all times, and to obey the Scout law".

I heard that in English, Gaelic, French, Dutch, Flemish, Danish, German, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese. That was possible because we had a common ground on which to meet. That is one of the things which people do not seem to have when they sit around the tables of the United Nations, but these Scouters were capable of showing their elders and betters a lesson or two.

I think that these sort of gatherings of young lads from various countries must be encouraged. Canada hopes to participate this coming summer in the second American Jamboree, which is being held in historic Valley Forge. There will gather there some 40,000 young lads from all over North America.

We hope to have a representative group from Canada who, I am sure, will give a good account of themselves.

Another example of Scout activity I saw not so long ago, was up at your Toronto District, Haliburton Camp. I went out by canoe in moonlight to a little rocky island to attend a camp fire of boys from what we sometimes call your "Less-Chance" areas. These young lads from poor homes, in many cases disrupted homes, were in one of your Toronto Scout troops run by three enthusiastic young men.

As we gathered on the Island one of the leaders jokingly said to the boys, "Here you are, lads, you are on this little island. There is no food and no canoes are coming back. What are you going to do for food?"

One of these cut-throats, with a nasty little leer, said "O.K., Skipper, let's cut up Benny."

Now the same lad, a few minutes later, amazed me, when this group of scouts, some 35 or 40 of them, representing about 10 different racial groups, and several different faiths, sat around in the light of the camp fire and sang, in almost beautiful voices, the Indian's version of the Lord's prayer.

Those boys were not angels, we were not trying to make them into angels. We were just trying to make them into the sort of citizens you want to have in this city.

I saw something of this sort of thing in the East End of London last September. I spent several days visiting Scout groups in the bomb-torn East end of the city. If you think you have some tough guys in the City of Toronto, you ought to see the lads in Hackney Wick and Stepney Green—they are really tough—and if any Scouters are here listening to me who are at all concerned about appearing in shorts, I can assure you it is quite an experience wearing them in the East End of London.

Yet, in spite of the torn and tattered homes in which those lads live, under proper leadership they are developing into the sort of citizens they would want in the East End of London. Those boys in many cases, through Scouting, are pulling themselves up by their own boot straps.

Another example of the same thing is going on here in Canada. We have what we call Lone Scouting—boys who live in out-of-way places, farmers' sons, boys who don't have contact with other boys. These Lone Scouts are serviced by the Association, by correspondence, by magazines and pamphlets, by occasionally bringing them into central training camps, and in some provinces even by weekly radio programs. These boys may on some occasions go for months without seeing another scout, and yet we have many examples of these boys grasping and living by the Scout spirit.

We have other examples of it in the North West Territories. We have Indian and Eskimo Scout troops. The farthest north Scout troops under our jurisdiction are in Aklavik and Tuktoyaktuk at the mouth of the Mackenzie. In many cases these communities are not too co-operative amongst themselves, and yet Scouting in many instances has brought the people of these communities together.

We have instances of missionaries of different Faiths, who perhaps have not been too co-operative in the past, sitting together on the same Scout Committee. We have examples of the white man and the aborigine co-operating for the good of the local Scout troops, which contain white boys, half-breeds, Eskimos and Indians. This is largely made possible by the fact that you can find a common ground for all these people of varying backgrounds providing the effort is made.

Since the war, we have organized Scout Troops in out-of-the-way military establishments such as Camp Borden, Shilo and Chilliwack. We are very proud of the fact that we have Cub Packs and Scout Troups in almost every army camp in the country. I know of one particular camp where the Commanding Officer told me he had been having a lot of trouble with young boys "Barrack Rats", they call them—damaging government property, breaking windows, etc. He said that when Cub Packs and Scout Troops were organized that disappeared, and they had not had a broken window for weeks, and he laid it all to the door of successful Cubbing and Scouting.

Another activity is Radio. We are sometimes told that Scouting is not modern, it is not up-to-date. Well, if training boys for radio work, training boys as auto mechanics, is not up-to-date, what is? For instance, in Alberta we have three ham radio stations, owned and manned by Boy Scouts. We hope we will have more.

Another activity is Exploration. We are trying to get these lads out into the open following the routes of the explorers, learning incidently, something about the history of their own land.

A group of Calgary Scouts not so long ago did a canoe trip through the Shuswap Lakes, following the route of David Thompson.

In the Gatineau and Laurentian districts we have had long range canoe trips. We hope that sort of thing will go on, because that advanced type of scouting is the sort of thing which will teach these boys how to live and take care of themselves. They return to the confusion of the city, more self-reliant citizens.

We have another example of what a man can do for boys. The famous big game hunter, Colonel Snyder takes a competitively selected group of scouts, from Alberta and Saskatchewaan, on a three weeks' trail ride through the foothills of Alberta. Those boys go back to their homes with an experience they will never forget.

We have many examples, particularly in Eastern Canada and in the Rockies, of Scout Ski Meets. Boys competing against one another, not often on an individual basis, but more often on a team basis, for the honour of their own particular group.

These are some examples of the sort of things we are trying to get these lads to do.

Of recent years we have paid great attention to Winter Scouting, scouting all year around, for we have felt in many cases there was a tendency for scout groups to stay indoors, in the church basement or the atmosphere of a school auditorium too frequently. While such meetings are necessary of course, it is much better that more troop meetings take place out of doors. To this end we have developed a Scout Winter uniform and Winter Handbook, which will make it safe and sensible to take boys out in a Canadian Winter. We have had boys fifteen years of age, properly equipped, sleeping out in tents and lean-to's in 30° below zero weather. If that does not make men of them, I don't know what will.

I could go on and give you many examples such as these I have given you. There are thousands of such stories. What does all this mean?

It means these various activities are providing the opportunities for boys, under proper leadership, to develop their spiritual strength and to develop mental adaptability, so they can get along with other people. They are developing some self-reliance in things material, and reliance on God in things spiritual.

That is what this is all about.

Our present position in Scouting today is most favourable. We are an expanding and developing movement. We have more boys on waiting lists than we can cope with. There are very few city Wolf Cub Packs which have not waiting lists.

We have new areas which we must service. We must do more in the rural districts; we must do more than we are doing amongst boys in the "less chance" areas of the big cities. We must do more for the boys in the North West Territories, and on the lonely islands on the Coasts.

We must more carefully select and train our leaders, and we must service them on the job.

There are many, many things which we must do. We are well aware of most of our own weaknesses. There is no doubt about it, in spite of these weaknesses we are growing, developing, improving and expanding. This has only been made possible by the loyalty and service of some 10,000 uniformed Commissioners and Cub and Scout Masters, who give thousands and thousands of man hours a year for the training of your sons and mine.

There is no doubt about it. You can look in any section of Canadian life, and you will find that amongst the younger elements the leader types are usually ex-Scouts. Five out of seven of one group of Rhodes Scholars were ex-Scouts. I can go on and give many examples on the Bench, the press, business and industry. There is no doubt about it, that Scouting does develop that spark of leadership in a boy, and it is leadership which we are going to need in the future, leadership in all parts, on all levels of our Canadian society.

We cannot do any more as an Association than we are doing now, unless the men and women, the businesses and corporations, the industries and governments of Canada are prepared to give us the tools to do the job. What we need, briefly, is more money and modern methods. We need more leaders, we need more money for the training of those leaders and for servicing them in their training for leadership of boys. We need constant study of our methods and techniques, to be sure we are up to date and that we are training boys to live in the sort of to-morrow they are going to have to face. That is why I leave with you the thought that the Scouts of to-day *are* the Men of to-morrow.

"EUROPE IS DYING"

AN ADDRESS BY

MARCUS LONG, M.A., Ph.D.

VICE-PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICE

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, February 23rd, 1950

MR. COLEBROOK:

Our Guest Speaker today is a philosopher, who is going to speak to us on his statement that "EUROPE IS DYING", which is the title of his address.

Your notice cards have given you the details of Doctor Long's interesting background. I shall, therefore, refrain from mentioning it further and at once call upon—Doctor Marcus Long, M.A., Ph.D., Vice-President of the International Student Service and Executive of the Canadian Council for Reconstructiton through UNESCO.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Chairman. It is reported that when Rita Hayworth went to the altar with the Aly Khan she said, "Unaccustomed as I am to doing this I am very happy to be here." This reported statement expresses my own feelings on this occasion. Do not misunderstand me, I am not expecting a baby for Christmas. I only mean that it is nice, on occasions, to get away from the classroom with its audience of poor but very critical students to a gathering such as this where the audience is first put into an indulgent mood by a good meal. And I am always happy when I have a chance to discuss the work of the International Student Service with which I have been identified since 1945. My happiness, however, is somewhat modified by the things I must report. The title of my address may have seemed to you a little sombre for a luncheon speech but these are dark days and we must be prepared to face facts which are often unpleasant if we are to conduct ourselves properly.

The most prominent fact is the importance of the doctrine of Karl Marx and the apparent success of the political imperialism associated with it. It is true that the predictions of Marx have been falsified by events. He predicted, on the basis of his reading of history, that the middle class would disappear, the lot of the worker grow steadily worse and the exploited people be forced to rise and destroy their capitalist masters. All of this to occur in the leading industrial countries. In fact the revolution has come only in backward agricultural countries like Russia and China. In the industrial countries the middle class has refused to perish and the workers, with their strong Unions, do not seem to be at the mercy of the Capitalists. Moreover, the recent developments in science and philosophy have made it impossible for informed and intelligent men to accept the naive materialism that is fundamental for the Marxist philosophy. Nevertheless the Marxian philosophy, which was scarcely noticed in the Nineteenth century can no longer be ignored and there is no doubt about the success of Communism. Communism has received a setback in Western Europe and, except for espionage, has little power in North America, but the subjugation of Eastern Europe is now complete and advances are being made in Asia. Whether it will ultimately triumph I do not know; I am not a prophet. I remember that Hitler predicted his system would triumph and that he would impose his brand of peace on the world for a thousand years. His ambitions were shattered against the indomitable will of free men. This is our real defence. Free men are always reluctant to engage in war but, because they identify their cause with history and humanity, when the need to strike arises they prove superior to the forces aligned against them. Conscious of the meaning of freedom they refuse to submit to slavery. It is my conviction that no system based on oppression can be maintained over a long period of time. Even if freedom should perish for a time and vanish from the earth it must rise again to be enshrined in the hearts of men and form the basis of just government. It is this conviction that gives strength to free men and makes them invincible.

You are familiar with the methods and progress of Communism on the larger theatre of events; I limit myself to a phase of their activities in the Universities.

I am an officer of the International Student Service, an organisation devoted to the maintenance of intellectual freedom and the development of international understanding among the members of the University community throughout the world. Non-discrimination in matters of race or belief is a cardinal principle of the organisation. We try to remind students and professors that beyond the differences of race, language and political and religious belief they share a common membership in the Commonwealth of the Mind and ought to share a common interest in the pursuit of Truth and the maintenance of intellectual freedom.

The organisation was formed, at the end of the First World War, to meet the urgent need for relief in the European Universities. When the need for relief was ended in the middle twenties it was decided to retain the organisation to facilitate contacts between students of different countries. Much excellent work was done in this direction until the beginning of the last war when operations had to be suspended. After this war the need for relief and reconstruction in Europe and Asia was so great that all our energies had to be devoted to this work of mercy. The larger work of international contacts had to be neglected and it is only now that we can begin to give it our attention again.

The Communists are not interested in organisations which insist on political neutrality and intellectual freedom. While we were devoting our efforts to relief a group of Communists, meeting in England in 1945, suggested a new organisation. This was formed in Prague in 1946 and called the International Union of Students. I am not sure if the title was purposely chosen to conflict with the title International Student Service but the confusion between ISS and IUS seems to be more than a casual coincidence.

The first organisational meeting of the IUS was a travesty on Democratic procedures. Delegates were invited from all countries but by political gerrymandering that would have done credit to a Chicago political machine the voting power was so juggled that the Communists were assured of a majority. The Chairman, a Communist, acknowledged only such speakers from the floor as suited his purpose so that the majority of speakers represented the party line. The Russian and satellite groups voted like well-drilled automata while the delegates from the Democratic countries split on almost every issue. But why continue the familiar and sordid story. The elected executive was predominantly Communist. They managed to insert into the constitution a clause requiring all member organisations to accept the programme and policy of the central committee. This was intended to give the Communists control over all the student organisations in the world. The Spider smacked his lips as he prepared to pounce on the innocent and trusting fly.

Here their enthusiasm misled them; they had moved too fast. The Dutch delegates withdrew and soon most of the Western delegates joined them. At the present time determined efforts are being made to woo them back again. While there is some division of opinion among our students the majority want nothing to do with it. Some of the more idealistic ones believe they ought to join in order to maintain international contacts and, perhaps, by discussion convert some of the Communists and change the nature of the organisation. This is an idle dream. Communists have shown that when they are a minority, as in our Trades-unions, they are capable of controlling the organisation; it is unlikely they will lose power when they are a majority.

The only organisation capable of offering significant opposition to the IUS is the ISS. But we are very limited. The IUS is heavily subsidised by the Russian and satellite governments. We must depend on voluntary gifts. That means we are never in a position to do the job we should like to do or the job that ought to be done. Perhaps an illustration will make the point clearer. When the IUS was formed they were given a building which a Canadian observer considered to be worth a million dollars. Last year the ISS got 18,000 dollars from its campaign in Canada. The difference between the Communistic and Democratic student groups is very apparent at conferences arranged by the IUS. Here the Communists come like a well-trained army with banners. They put on pageants which show long training and unlimited funds. The Democratic students, say from Canada and the United States, attend without financial support and without any definite programme and put on hastily prepared shows that seem silly beside the well-produced shows of the Communists. The propaganda value of this is immense.

In a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post there is an article on the World Youth and Student Festival sponsored by the IUS in Budapest last summer. The article describes the pageantry I have mentioned. I am most interested in the closing comments. "We ought not to underestimate the effect on the young people of the world of such carefully slanted affairs as this World Youth Festival. The Communists are paying a great deal of attention to the younger generation. If that younger generation doesn't get to hear or see the other side of the picture about the United States and soon, it will be next to impossible to change their minds about us." Apply this statement to North America in general and I should subscribe to this reading of events. There is the situation and there is the challenge. Last year we had 18,000 dollars with which to combat it. The Government of Canada, like that of many Western countries, is reluctant to support international student activities. If my information on the situation is correct, and I believe it is, they must change this policy—and soon.

I have been referring to Western Europe and North

America so far. There is another area and, in terms of long-range programmes, it is the most important area, South-east Asia. Here we have unlimited opportunities at the present time. The IUS claims the adherence of the student-bodies in this region but I have official and dependable information that this is not so. These students do not want to identify themselves with this Communist organisation but are in a dilemma because they feel the need for some international contacts. They are afraid of Western organisations because they expect either discrimination or an attitude of superiority. We must get in there and show them that we are prepared to meet them as equals and show that our belief in the principles of Democracy is a live and vital thing. Mr. Sigward Wolontis, the general secretary of ISS, has just completed a tour of South-east Asia. He was in Toronto last week-end after visiting in the United States. He gave us a clear picture of the situation, the needs and the opportunities. He reported that the American students have planned a seminar for India next Fall where students from the United States can meet with Indians to discuss their mutual problems under the guidance of American and Indian professors. We ought to be doing something similar. The ISS is holding its annual international conference in India next August. We ought to have some delegates from Canada to show the students in Asia that we are interested in them and encourage them to share with us devotion to Democratic principles. This is a strategic and critical moment but we do not have the money to send anyone.

Within the limits of our budget we are doing what we can. Perhaps more than our budget would seem to justify. I have already pointed out that we only received 18,000 dollars last year. With this money we maintained an administrative staff in Canada, handpicked 25 D.P. students who had fled from Communist dominated countries to the D.P. camps of Germany and Austria and brought them to Canada where they are studying in our Universities, provided the machinery for sending 25,000 dollars worth of medical supplies to hospitals caring for students, contributed to material relief in various parts of the world, contributed to the administrative staff of our International organisation in Geneva and organised and conducted an International seminar in Europe where 47 Canadian students met with 90 European students to discuss their mutual problems. Altogether we parlayed our 18,000 dollar budget into services worth at least 130,000 dollars.

The most significant of these enterprises from the standpoint of combatting the Communist threat was the International seminar. The Canadian Council for Reconstruction through UNESCO gave us the money to run the seminar in Europe and the Provincial Governments contributed to the transportation expenses of the Canadian students. This enabled us to take some of the best of our students from coast to coast, including French-Canadians.

The seminar, this summer, was our second venture. The first was held in Germany in 1948 in co-operation with the British authorities as part of their programme for the re-education of German youth. It was so successful we felt justified in organising the second which was held this past summer in Holland. The Dutch Government gave us the use of Castle Bouvigne, a small castle nestled in the woods at a town named Breda on the Belgian border. Here 130 students from Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, the United Kingdom, Holland, Dutch Guiana, Indonesia and Canada lived together for five weeks discussing the general problem of the Individual and Society, or Order and Freedom, under the guidance of distinguished Canadian professors. Dean de Koninck (Laval), Professor Baudoin (McGill), Dean Douglas, Professor Brady, Professor Lynch (Toronto) Mr. Macdonald (Ontario College of Art) and Mr. Shea (Manitoba) were the Canadian staff. It is a matter of sincere delight for me to announce that these men were so impressed with what we are doing they worked without any remuneration and in some cases paid all or a substantial part of their own transportation expenses. They believed in the work and each of them made a significant contribution to clearer thinking on the part of the Students about the meaning, history and practice of Democracy. Time will not permit me to discuss the details of the programme, nor to read excerpts from the appreciative letters received from the students, nor to attempt an estimate of the ultimate value of such meetings on the mind of outstanding students. We are quite aware that this contribution was small, we do not suppose that the world will be saved for democracy by this small effort. We do know that if we do nothing we shall lose everything and that it is impossible to determine the returns to an investment in young people some of whom are destined by their ability and training to be leaders in their own countries in the not very distant future. We do know from our first gathering that the impact of such meetings on the minds of these young people is very great. And we are very conscious, from the activities of the Communists, that we shall neglect this field at our peril. I do not hesitate to say that both of these seminars were a success by any standard we can use and that they deserve to be continued. The Canadian Council for Reconstruction through UNESCO has been so impressed with the work done that they have provided enough money for a third seminar to be held this summer in France. It is unfortunate for us that this excellent organisation is passing out of existence this year since it will make it necessary, if we are to continue, to look elsewhere for support.

It seems to me that the necessity for these seminars might be best illustrated against the present situation and problems of Western Europe. The title of my address *Europe is Dying* suggests a rather pessimistic view. To avoid the suggestion that this represents a merely personal point of view I shall base my remarks on statements made by distinguished Europeans who came to the seminar to deliver special lectures.

The first speaker was Professor Siegfried, well-known to most of you as the author of several excellent books on North America. He discussed the similarities and differences between Europe and North America and stressed the fact that the major problem of Europe is that of over-population. A casual glance at the European scene confirms his diagnosis. Holland has a population of 10,000,000 in an area that could possibly support 5,000,000. This population increases by 200,000 per annum which means that new sources of employment must be found for 45,000 workers every year. This is completely impossible. Canadians won the affection of the Dutch for the part we played in the liberation of their country; that affection is being increased by our present policy of admitting Dutch immigrants to Canada. The number we can accept does not make an appreciable difference to their problem but it is something.

The problem cannot be solved within Holland because, like so many other European problems, it is tied up with religious and political issues. Professor Siegfried advocated birth-control as the only sensible solution. This is not feasible in Holland. At the present time the population is 60% Protestant and 40% Catholic. The political issues represent this religious division. The Catholics will not practice birth-control because it is contrary to their convictions; the Protestants will not practice it because this would be equivalent to surrendering political power to the Catholics.

This same problem of over-population is to be seen in Italy. Those of you who have visited Italy will recall the houses perched precariously on the sides of mountains as the peasants seek to eke out a living from the last inch of soil. There is not nearly enough to go around. The Evening Telegram put it succinctly this week when it said of Italy that it has 'the worst over-population, the greatest unemployment and the lowest average income in western Europe.' I recall one trip I made from Naples to Rome. We stopped by the side of the road for lunch in what we considered a secluded spot but it was only a matter of minutes until we were surrounded by a crowd of hungry urchins. We had brought along a loaf of bread and a tin of salmon to make sandwiches. After emptying the tin we casually threw it out the window. I shall never forget the sight of those dirty, ragged urchins almost killing each other to get hold of the empty tin to scrape out the few remaining flakes of salmon.

It is perhaps not proper to discuss conditions in England on the day of the election but surely the basic problem of England is also that of over-population. England is not capable of supporting a population of 50,000,000 people from her own resources. She is forced to import not only luxuries but necessities thus exposing herself to all the vagaries of international trade.

The problem is bound to become more intense as time goes on. At the beginning of this century North America welcomed immigrants from Europe and these countries were able to get rid of a large part of their surplus. Today Canada and the United States admit only a trickle. At the beginning of the century there were colonies in Africa and Asia where the more adventurous or more desperate could go. The rising nationalism in Asia has shut off that avenue of escape. More and more these countries will be forced to retain their surplus populations and with that will come a steadily depressed standard of living, increasing unemployment and widespread poverty, the conditions out of which Communism arises and flourishes.

The full impact of the problem has not yet been felt because of Marshall aid. It was astonishing to see the difference this summer from last as the countries of Western Europe began to reestablish themselves with American assistance. Holland, France, Germany and Austria, which I visited, were changed more than seemed possible. One American official estimated that the German economy was back to 80% of its pre-war level and one could feel again something of the prewar gaiety and love of life in the streets of Paris. The only country that had not made a significant improvement was England. It was possible this summer to eat better in Western

Germany than in England, a trite commentary on the expression that to the victors belong the spoils. I say this problem must become more intense and with it the threat of Communism. No understanding of modern Europe is possible if it is ignored.

The second important factor is the move towards the United States of Europe. Dr. Nord who, with Mr. Duncan Sandys, the son-in-law of Winston Churchill, is one of the leading exponents of the movement spoke to us about the history and development of the movement one month before the Council met at Strasbourg. It was he who said Europe is Dying. He saw Europe caught between two great powers which threatened her existence. On the one hand Russia is threatening to overthrow the present political systems and introduce a political system which is contrary to their traditions and contrary to their ideas of how free people ought to be governed. On the other hand the United States is threatening the culture of Europe by cheap Hollywood films and cheap music. We shall not grasp the significance of this point unless we remember that the European considers his culture and his civilisation as inseparable. Any attack on the one is a threat to the existence of the other. I have not mentioned the fear of economic domination which is also a factor.

Faced with these dangers the European can only find salvation in union. There are serious obstacles to the realisation of union and it may very well be doubted if it will ever be achieved. It is obvious that any union would involve a free exchange of populations. A citizen of Michigan can move to California without securing a passport or permission from some central agency. In the same way in the United States of Europe a citizen of Belgium would have free access to Holland and other countries. One can imagine the reluctance of the French to enter a system which would lower their barriers and allow a few million Italians to cross their border freely. This is a minor point. There are serious question of economic arrangements and commitments in war that are difficult to face. And there is the problem of Germany. Germany because of her location, industrial potential, scientific skill and economic ties must be admitted to the Union. The governments of the formerly occupied countries are justly afraid that this would mean the rise of a new and threatening Germany. Add to these the traditional divisions and antagonisms between these different peoples and you see how impossible the scheme is. Weigh well the obstacles and then see how far the movement has advanced and you will have a fairly accurate measure of how seriously the Europeans consider their problems. Dr. Nord, an exponent of the idea, was anxious to see it developing slowly; his great fear, when he was speaking to us, was that things were moving too rapidly. He must have been convinced of this when he found the French prepared to risk the dangers of admitting Germany into the Council. The European is impressed with the impending doom of his civilisation and way of life and is prepared to try harsh remedies to avoid the threatened fate.

The only real opposition to the Federation of Europe comes from the British government. I am not sure of all the reasons for their attitude. The most prominent argument is that close tie with the continent of Europe might destroy the bonds of Commonwealth and they consider the Commonwealth more important than a close alliance with Europe. If these are the issues then we can hardly quarrel with them. Unfortunately we remember that Winston Churchill who affirmed that he would not be present at the liquidation of the Empire is one of the prime movers and most enthusiastice supporters of the movement. It is certain that no Union can be achieved without the support of Great Britain and it is beyond my powers to predict what may happen. I merely use this movement as an illustration of my general theme that the Europeans are alarmed about their present and future state.

There remains only the problem of Germany, that most complicated and perplexing of all European problems. It would be easy here to indulge in generalisations but I venture to affirm that no generalisations can meet the German situation. The Germans having sown the wind are now reaping the whirlwind. The country which hoped to straddle the world is now beaten and bewildered.

If one crosses the German border from Arnhem in Holland the first German city is Emmerick. Looking from the station there is not a house to be seen, not even the shell of a house, only piles of brick and rubble. The German guards, in their gray uniforms, move through this desolation like ghosts through a city of the dead. Over everything is the pallor of death and destruction. The same situation is repeated, in different degrees, in all the great cities that we have identified with German greatness. Everywhere there are ruins. Only wisps of smoke creeping up through the rubble are there to remind you that these people are now finding shelter in cellars and living under the ruins of their former homes.

It is impossible to understand the German problem unless some psychological characteristics are kept in mind. In the first place, the Germans lack a sense of realism about their own past. They cannot understand why non-Germans consider them a militaristic people since they look on themselves as lovers of peace who have only engaged in war when it was forced on them. The stories about atrocities carry no conviction. They affirm that the pictures of thousands of corpses dug from the pits of concentration camps are merely propaganda pictures. They insist that trucks went to the cemeteries and dug up bodies to put together for pictures. In any case they insist that no atrocities charged against the Germans could equal the atrocities committed by the Allied airmen and they point, for confirmation, to the ruins in their cities and speak of the thousands of German civilians buried underneath them whose bodies have not yet been recovered. In the second place they suffer from political apathy. The large number of voters turning out to the last election proves nothing other than a desire to protest against the Russians and the Allied governments. They cannot be enticed into party affiliations. Even the Communists complain that they cannot attract the young people into their party. Perhaps it is because they suffered so much from recent political events that they are scared to take part. Whatever the reason it is a poor omen for the day when the government of their country is restored to the German people. In the third place they are completely inept in Democratic procedures. We must not forget that the Germans have only experienced Democracy twice and on both occasions it was imposed by a conquering enemy and maintained by the unsheathed bayonet. Democracy cannot be transplanted from one country to another; it must grow out of the struggles and traditions of a people. It is only necessary to read the comments of Nietzsche about the German people in the nineteenth century to realise that they are incapable of grasping and practising this system of government. It means a change in the character of the people and this can only be achieved through education.

It is here our occupying powers have failed most tragically. It seems to me the major source of the failure lay in the denazification policy as applied to centres of learning. It is easy to be wise after the event. I am quite sure I should have supported the policy of denazification when it was first suggested for it would seem improper to retain teachers who had been associated with the Nazi system. However, to dismiss all suspects meant wiping out a whole generation of teachers, leaving education in the hands of the very old and the very young. It soon became apparent this would not work. Unfortunately in rehiring teachers many of the real Nazis were brought back. The younger liberals saw their chances for promotion cancelled by the appointment of these senior men whose history they knew. These people, on whom so much depends, felt that the West had let them down. There are other factors involved which are beyond my competence to discuss and time would not permit. It is enough to say that not enough attention has been paid to this phase of the German problem. A prominent American statesman upbraided the American authorities in 1948 because he said they were talking about educating the German people without doing anything concrete about it. We have failed here and it was the one place where we needed to succeed.

Do not assume from what I have said that I believe the Germans are going to restore the Nazi regime. It is necessary here to distinguish between nationalism and Naziism. That there is a rising tide of Nationalism is unquestionable but that is not unexpected. The German people have always loved their country; they are proud of its culture, its achievements in science and industry. We cannot expect any people to give up their devotion to their country because they have been defeated in a war. The danger is that ardent nationalists, untrained in the meaning of democracy and bewildered as the German people are today may feel the need to align themselves with a leader who promises to take them out of the wilderness into the promised land. At the present time their sympathies and interests are with the West. Perhaps I can express the confusion best by a statement made to me by a German student. "The German people," he said, "are looking for a democratic *leader*," without realising the contradiction.

It is this need to re-educate the German people that has played a large part in the selection of European students for our seminars. Always we have invited more participants from Germany than from any other country. And I am pleased to say that the impact upon them has been most impressive and, I believe, lasting. In all cases they have returned to their Universities and organised clubs for the discussion of democratic ideas and practices.

I suggested that my presentation of the situation might seem somewhat pessimistic and gloomy. I have not tried to paint the picture in glowing terms that would falsify the reality. Unfortunately it has not been possible to present the brighter side as well and there are bright sides also. But we shall not become aware of our real obligations until we remove all the veneer and see the problem in all its ugliness. That there is a problem is obvious.

What may be done about it is not so clear. I think that part of the job must be done through such seminars as we are conducting.

We in Canada must assure the people of Western Europe that we are interested in their survival and the restoration of their great culture from which we have borrowed so much. We must assure them that we consider freedom the most precious of man's possessions; a heritage rich with the blood of those who sacrificed themselves that their children might live in the true dignity of man.

We shall delude ourselves if we think economic assistance is the full discharge of our duty. Canada is a world-power, a highly respected world-power and it becomes our responsibility to nourish and maintain democratic ideas and ideals in a Continent where they are all challenged and threatened with extinction. We shall fool ourselves if we believe our destiny is not affected by what happens in Europe; two world-wars should have taught us better. It is a matter of simple self-preservation that we should assume the responsibility of maintaining Western Europe and encouraging the Europeans to maintain the institutions of a free people without which their Continent will pass into the shadows of eternal night. Europe is dying. So say the Europeans. It is up to us who are young and strong and aware of the vitality of institutions to save them from that death and by preserving Europe put an end to the tyrannies that would engulf us and turn free men into slaves.

"THE BRITISH ELECTION"

An Address By

WARREN BALDWIN

Senior Parliamentary Correspondent,
The Globe & Mail

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, March 2nd, 1950

Mr. Hermant:

We are to hear an address today by Mr. Warren Baldwin, Senior Parliamentary Correspondent for The Globe and Mail, who has just returned from England, where he covered the recent British Election Campaign for his great newspaper. We have read his "On the Spot" accounts of the campaign, and therefore we are particularly pleased to have him with us in person today. Mr. Baldwin was born in Toronto, and is a direct descendant of the Honourable Robert Baldwin, who with Lafontaine formed a Ministry in 1842, and again in 1848, which made a great contribution to the development of Responsible Government in this country and is known as the first true Cabinet in Colonial history. Mr. Baldwin will now speak to us on the subject: "Tne British Election".

Mr. Baldwin:

It would be extreme arrogance even for a newspaperman whose errors are so often treated with tolerance to suggest that I could spend two short weeks in Britain and come back with any real knowledge of what had happened or why it has happened. I went over with so many questions. Was a Socialist Britain really different from the Britain we had known in the past? To what extent were present hardships the price of Britain's Herculean stand for freedom? To what extent were they the price of a new experiment in Government? And make no mistake about it there are still hardships even with high wages and employment and a food situation very greatly improved.

Finally, I suppose there is the question we have all been asking—whether we admit it or not—Is the maintenance of close economic ties with the United Kingdom to day worth the effort we are making and the effort we will have to make? I can answer only one of these questions with any sort of conviction. I believe it is very much worth any effort—yes, and almost any sacrifice—to maintain and regain the close associations with Britain on which the economy of this country was first developed.

In a sense it will be a new association. I think you will agree that the tariff protected Commonwealth trading bloc as we knew it before the War, like the era of British investment in this country, is gone. The centre of the world has shifted and I believe in this new era it is Canada who will be called upon to take the initiative in co-operative efforts to solve our mutual problems.

But in all this I must make one reservation. I believe, Sir, that you do not want to hear political speeches at these gatherings but perhaps I may be forgiven for this one reference because I think these days we should look at these things realistically and speak of them frankly. If a certain element in Britain's Socialist Government which has been making Anglo-Canadian relations more difficult in the past five years should gain control in the present political crisis, further co-operative effort might be rendered useless. I say that after talking to many Labour supporters who are worried over the possibility.

I don't think it will happen. I know the great majority of the British people don't want it to happen and I believe in a sense that was what their vote meant last Thursday. Let me try to picture one scene in a big dingy London hall. It is the last night of the campaign and the obvious uncertainty as to the result has injected a new intensity of feeling and temper into the meetings. Lord Woolton is trying to speak. The soft spoken merchant Peer and Minister of Food in the Churchill war cabinet has been howled down at two previous meetings and the crowd of labour supporters in front of him looks just as hostile. The Conservative candidate, a native of New Zealand, sits nervously nearby. Mention of his name has brought boos from the crowd.

Suddenly, Lord Woolton turns and points to him. "Have you forgotten," he asks the crowd, "what New Zealand, what Australia, what Canada did for you in the War?" The boos fade to murmurings and die. For five minutes the speaker holds his crowd on this theme. Our business, he declares, is to get unity inside the Empire and a Commonwealth solidly working together. He pauses and the crowd breaks into a thunder of applause.

I don't know whether that particular Tory candidate made the grade. I don't think he did. But for the moment in that bare hall a kinship had been created which transcended the party battle—transcended even the fundamental differences between the philosophies of socialism and free enterprise. Gentlemen, that sort of thing may not solve our trade problems. It may not mean that the Canadian farmer will sell more of his bacon or his eggs in the British market, but somehow it sends one away with a reassuring feeling that those problems can and will be solved.

Now I don't want to leave the impression that this was typical of the campaign. The issue of Empire trade and a united commonwealth was fought for the most part in Lord Beaverbrook's Daily Express. There was no perceptible reaction from the man on the street. Nor did he seem at all interested in the pros and cons of devaluation or dollar shortages or the convertibility of sterling. He knew he was getting more pounds in his pay envelope—many more than he had ever seen before. He wasn't particularly interested in whether the outside world had or hadn't lost confidence in them.

No, with the single exception perhaps of the Churchill proposal for new talks with Stalin, the election was really fought, as perhaps most elections should be fought, on the issues that dig directly into the lives and pockets of the ordinary man. Jobs, houses, food, the cost of living, and taxes. The Labour government boasted quite truly that in their term of office they had freed three million seven hundred and fifty thousand people from income tax. But even here, of course, there is still indirect taxation. A package of twenty of the cheapest cigarettes today costs three shilling, sixpence, about fifty cents at present rate of exchange of which the government takes in taxes two shilling, ninepence or about forty-two cents. Not much wonder Sir Stafford Cripps stopped smoking. But on the day before the vote the Tories distributed millions of little sheets. They showed a gleeful Chancellor of the Exchequer grabbing all but three cigarettes from the package of a mournful smoker. They announced and quite accurately: "Before you take one Sir Stafford Cripps takes seventeen." Underneath it read: "Today the Socialist Government takes eight shillings in taxation out of every pound you earn. There was no answer to that and my guess is that it may have been responsible for swinging quite a few hesitant votes the next day. Nor was there any answer which appealed to the man earning $21.50 a week who paid $3.75 a week in income tax alone.

Figures, I know, make dull speeches but with the help of a British publication, I made the following simple comparison which may of some interest. The sources are the British statistical service and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics:

	United Kingdom	United States	Canada
National Income	$32,603,000,000	$188,191,000,000	$12,588,000

	Percentage of National Income	Percentage of National Income	Percentage of National Income
Total taxes	40.5%	23.8%	19.8%
Debt charges	5.4%	2.4%	3.6%

Food subsidies 4.4%	0.2%	Nil
Social Security expenditure 11.1%	4.0%	No comparative figure.

Of course, it would be manifestly unfair to blame high taxation entirely on a Socialist Government. But during an election campaign it is fair game in any country and it was certainly a factor in that vote which so nearly defeated the Attlee Government.

Housing, I think, was a much lesser issue. Not that there is no shortage. If you take the Canadian situation and on top of it flatten out some fifty thousand existing homes, you might get something comparable. But it was difficult to put too much blame on the Government on this score and I think the great masses of the people saw through any attempts to do so. The Government had promised about a million and a half dwelling units and built a million. But the British worker had the satisfaction of knowing that if he couldn't get a shelter, no amount of money could build a mansion. In fact, he is getting priority. For the most part, building is concentrated on small units, some of them prefabricated. Others functional to the point of appalling ugliness.

But food is a different matter. I've heard so many people come back to Canada and say you could get anything you liked in Britain today. That is true if you live in London's best hotels. But the great mass of voters don't. They make do at home with rationed butter and eggs and sugar and soap, and meat which is pretty poor quality when you do get it. And they eat lunches in cheaper restaurants where the food is certainly nothing to tempt even a normal appetite. And they queue up for their meals and for a lot of other things. There's something about that British queue which I can't explain but which worries me. Britons have always been the pattern of a law-abiding nation. I love the story of the solitary taxicab standing at a deserted London intersection with bombs falling all around—waiting for the red light to change. But this queueing is something different. It seems to be becoming a state of mind.

And I was frankly a little concerned, too, talking to the secretary of a business man in a London office one morning who wanted to come to Canada with her husband. Her first questions were not about opportunities for work. She wanted to know how unemployment relief in Canada compared with Britain. I could have told her it is more generous. I didn't. I suggested that if her husband and she had good jobs they had better stay where they were. I don't think that is really typical of the British attitude—not yet at any rate.

But I think perhaps the Socialists' full employment slogan may have been the greatest single factor in preventing defeat of the Attlee Government. Full employment is a fact. It is a fact, also, that a great many people are afraid they might not have a job tomorrow. There was a generally and perhaps justified feeling that the boom was at an end. And the Socialists were able to sell the idea that the Tories would bring its end much faster. The Laborites never spelled out very clearly how they intended to maintain full employment, but generally it was the same age-old pump priming promises heard from any economic planners. It's familiar enough over here but it must be admitted that a Socialist Government has one extra ace in the hole. When you own 15 percent of the productive capacity of a nation and control another 15 percent, it makes the problem of maintaining and creating jobs just that much simpler.

A good deal of all this was in the background rather than the forefront of the campaign. I think it was accepted on both sides that whatever government came into power, Britain was in for a difficult time in the months ahead. The effects of devaluation are being felt slightly already in the cost of living. They haven't hit yet in the place where they spell jobs. New shipments of raw materials are just beginning to flow from other countries to the British factories at much higher sterling prices.

Costs are bound to rise. There may be new wage demands and these things may play hob not only with Britain's dollar export plans but with her ability to sell in the buyers' market now developing in the sterling area itself. These possibilities are keeping industrialists awake at nights in London, in Birmingham and in Manchester. But quite naturally labour leaders weren't in the mood to say too much about them and Mr. Churchill, I suppose, knew well that any talk of coming unemployment would be more likely to swing votes to the Socialist camp than his own.

Incidentally, I 've heard that at least one report coming back to this country has described Churchill in this compaign as a pitiful figure. Please don't believe that. I don't mean that he wasn't tired by the end of the campaign. I don't mean that he isn't, as he described himself, an old man. I'm not even sure whether he would today make the best Prime Minister. And obviously the electorate wasn't sure either. But he still has his own incomparable drawing power. The Socialists, I think, were lucky. They didn't have to make comparisons in personality. "Attlee has no color", one man told me, "but he's such a decent little fellow". That was true and a lot of people voted for that decent little fellow. But Churchill was and still remains the idol of the nation.

I listened to his final broadcast, sitting among a group of Londoners, all of whom had been through the Blitz. It wasn't one of his better efforts but he was using the old wartime technique—the old blood, sweat and tears theme. "Grapple with your problems while your ancient strength is still with you". You could almost see the minds and hearts around me turning back the pages of memory. No gentlemen, Winston Churchill can never be a pitiful figure. What's more, I firmly believe that if there had been any real sense of emergency about this election campaign, the people of England would have swept him back into power.

But there was no sense of emergency and until the end of the campaign no apparent interest. It would have been dull, too, without the repartee that British audiences delight in. Someone said the other day that the British were the most politically literate people in the world. I'm not sure about that. When it comes to sorting out issues I'd just as soon take the Canadian voter. But the Briton takes a lot more fun out of his election meetings. I think the story has already got back to Canada of the Labour member expounding the benefits of the welfare state, free glasses, free dentistry, free doctoring. "And who", he asked "is responsible for those bonny children playing on our streets today." The answer came from the back of the hall: "Free enterprise".

One thing, of course, that was bound to strike a Canadian was the fact that the very things which might have made this election of vital importance to this country were mentioned hardly at all. Could Britain get on her own feet before Marshall aid disappeared in 1952? The Labor manifesto made no mention of Marshall aid. Were the Socialists really sincere in their backing of the dollar export drive? As far as I know they were never challenged on this point by Conservatives or Liberals. Would the Conservatives, if elected, really wipe out the system of bulk purchasing by the state—a system which, in all fairness, we must admit was very useful to Canada while Canadian food was being bought—but a system which strikes at free trade and competition and is the very root of the controls and regimentation to which the people of Britain are subject today. Well, the vote last Thursday left that question unanswered, though I believe in a typically ingenious sort of way the British voter has checkmated the advance of socialism for the present at least. It has, of course, produced all the elements for a political crisis and it is hard to see how another year can pass without a second election. But in the meantime, it is doubtful whether Mr. Attlee will continue any further with the sort of nationalization of industry which, to quote the Economist, has never had efficiency as its main objective. It is doubtful whether even the steel legislation will be implemented.

I'm not an economist and don't intend to try to talk learnedly about an economic situation which has me completely baffled. But I had some slight opportunity of watching Britain's dollar exports board in action. Their offices are a hive of activity. They are working hard to increase Britain's Canadian and American dollar earnings but they are up against three main difficulties in swinging industry generally behind their drive. First there is still a good deal of that feeling—and I'm quoting members of the board themselves—that North America should be glad to get British goods at any price and on any terms of delivery. That is gradually being eliminated. But more important, they have to fight against what is really good sound business sense from the standpoint of the exporter. Most of these industries are established in sterling markets. Even with devaluation of the pound, it is still hardly more profitable to sell in the dollar area. And they have the extra cost of breaking into new markets on this side of the Atlantic. But it is not so much profit as risk that is holding them back. They have had experience before of being shut out of the American market as soon as the size of their exports presented a sufficient challenge to American home production. There is not the same feeling about Canada. But British industry is hesitant about leaving established sterling markets for this sort of adventure. And today production is just not large enough to feed both markets. How to increase it is a real problem. I could find little backing for the popular view that the British workman under socialism isn't working hard enough. In any event, it is questionable whether this would make any appreciable difference. The key to the problem, I was told, is machines. While Britain has been exporting all the capital goods she could produce to Europe, to India and to some extent North America, her own industrial plant remains run down and obsolete.

But allowing for one hundred percent success in the dollar export drive, it is obvious that this would only scrape the surface of the problem. In the old days production of the British factory was going to the building of foreign investment—to the creation of debts owing to Britain by other countries. Today it is going, or a large part of it, to pay Britain's debts. There are still, I think, something over ten billions of dollars in debts to sterling countries. As you know, there are two sides to this sterling debt problem. For a government sworn to a program of full employment they can be an asset as well as a liability. Up to the moment, at least, India and other sterling countries demanding liquidation of their balances have been not too particular about the price they paid for unrequited exports. The British taxpayer, of course, in the end pays, but the British workman is kept busy producing the goods. Anyway the Labor government has been liquidating these debts at a rate which it is admitted on all sides has tremendously increased her dollar problems. So long as this continues, there is obviously going to be no demand for sterling in the dollar countries no matter how much we are willing to buy of British goods.

Now, I know I'm in away over my depth but if you'll bear with me just a minute longer I'll try to come to the surface. I was talking to a particularly astute British business man in London, last week. He was a good Conservative and confidently predicting a Tory victory. After going over all the baffling problems ahead and admitting that a Conservative Government might have no better rabbit than the socialists to pull out of the hat, he emerged with this statement. The real hope for the breaking down of the sterling dollar wall lay not so much in immediate balancing of trade books as in restoring confidence in sterling which really meant restoring confidence in Britain as a going concern. He suggested that if sterling in free market should rise to the present pegged price the day of convertibility might not be far away. Of course, he was arguing that a Conservative victory would do just that. But the question I took away with me —and the question I would like to leave with you here, today, is simply this: "How many of us in this sense are still selling the pound sterling short".

I suppose most of you have had the same experience of standing on the sidewalk at Trafalgar Square or Piccadilly Circus and watching that maze of taxicabs and buses and cars all seeming to be going in every direction without the semblance of order or timing. Yet you know that if you step off the curb you have a far better chance of getting safely to the other side than you have in crossing Yonge Street. And you know, too, that if you hail one of those battered taxicabs and tell the driver to take you to some obscure place without a street number he will get you there. You can call it all muddling through and I admit it takes a good deal of faith to be convinced that it works. They are the most exasperating people on earth. Faced with a decision at the polls which you and I might consider terribly final they vote neither one way or the other.

It is hard to suggest what may lie ahead. It may be that North America should shoulder a large part of the sterling debt. It may be that a Commonwealth Conference being urged now from both sides of the Atlantic might help. But I'm sure of this. If we want to find the solution in the coming months and years you and I will be called upon to believe much more aggressively than we have in the future of Britain.

"BUSINESS ACTION"

AN ADDRESS BY

C. GORDON COCKSHUTT, M.C.

PRESIDENT, COCKSHUTT PLOW CO. LTD.

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, March 9th, 1950

MR. HERMANT:

Members and Guests of The Empire Club of Canada: We are to hear an Address today by Mr. C. Gordon Cockshutt, M.C., President of the Cockshutt Plow Co., of Brantford, Ont. In addition to the active management of his great Company, Mr. Cockshutt has a wide variety of business interests embodying nearly every facet of industrial and commercial activity. His distinguished family have made a great contribution to the industrial development of this Country. In addition to this Mr. Cockshutt has been a devoted servant of the Empire, of Canada, and his own Community of Brantford. Promoted to the Rank of Captain in the Field in World War I he was awarded the Military Cross. He has been Chairman of the Anglo-Canadian Trade Committee since its inception. Mr. Cockshutt has served for two years as President of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce to the Members of which we extend a very special welcome to-day. He is a Past-President of the Brantford Board of Trade, and has taken an active and continuing interest in many communal activities there.

The business community can be well proud of this example of good citizenship. Mr. Cockshutt has recently returned from England and he is going to speak to us now on "Business Action". Mr. Gordon Cockshutt.

MR. COCKSHUTT:

Gentlemen: It is always a privilege to meet the members of the Empire Club and today I enjoy a particular honour in having the pleasure of speaking to you concerning a subject which is, I know, very much in the minds of all of us these days.

I refer, of course, to Canada's trade with other members of the British Commonwealth and Empire, and with the world at large, and particularly I want to tell you something of what Canadian businessmen are trying to do to help to solve the very difficult problems which our country is now facing in the world of trade.

As many of you perhaps know, for a number of years I have been closely associated with the Chamber of Commerce movement in Canada. Co-ordinating the activities of the Chamber of Commerce movement at the national level is The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. It is only during the past few years that The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has come to the attention of many Canadians—even Canadian businessmen. Particularly since the end of the recent war, The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has become a national force in Canada.

I believe this reflects the determination of businessmen to take a more active part in the national affairs of our country. It reflects also, an awareness that if business does not play an active part in the national affairs of the country, then someone else will. If the business point of view is not presented to the Canadian people by businessmen themselves, then obviously it will not be presented at all, and the public of Canada will derive their appreciation of business from those who do not understand or sympathize with its problems.

At the end of the war, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce had a membership of 150 Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce in that many cities throughout Canada. At the present time, The Canadian Chamber membership numbers more than 645 Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce in that many communities, in every Province of Canada from British Columbia to Newfoundland.

The Canadian Chamber is concerned with all those matters which affect business in this country—and these days that covers a lot of ground. This is one reason why its membership has increased so rapidly. The Canadian Chamber is carrying the ball for business in many places where the individual businessman could not undertake to carry the ball for himself. Another reason for the widespread national support of The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has been the determination of this organization and men who comprise it, to defend Canadian and North American traditions, to strengthen the North American way of life.

Canadian and United States businessmen are perhaps inclined to be a little more practical about the things which contribute to a country's greatness than are some other sections of the population. Did you ever stop to consider the weight of responsibility which rests on the business community? Other groups govern, levy taxes, pass rules and regulations; other people may criticize the system, may denounce the distribution of wealth, may draw up plans to place the means of production under government control, but while all this is going on, business must keep the machine running.

These other activities are not productive of wealth, and if business did not keep turning out the goods and paying the taxes and contributing to all the causes which are deserving of support, then what would happen? None of us is so naive as to say that there are no faults to be found with business in this country, any more than we would say there are no faults to be found with politicians or housewives or labour, or for that matter with human nature. The point is, that when all has been said and done, this economic system which is in operation in the North American continent—call it free enterprise if you will—this system does work and does produce wealth and does furnish to the people of Canada and the United States the highest living standard in the world. This is a hard fact which cannot be challenged. Yet it is a fact which is often forgotten in the intricacies of political discussion, in reading and writing about the idealistic

Utopias held out by this or that political theorist.

I think that the growth of The Canadian Chamber of Commerce since the war is a very plain indication that Canadian businessmen realize that they must place these facts before their fellow countrymen, and I think it can be said that The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has been quite successful in carrying out a broad program of information describing in factual, often statistical terms just what the system of private enterprise is and why it deserves the support of every thinking Canadian.

Of almost equal importance with the defence of our way of life is the subject of foreign trade. During the war, with the necessity for government control of so much of the means of production and distribution, particularly in the international field, there grew up the tendency to regard international trade as almost a closed preserve of government officials. A little unprejudiced thought will make clear the absurdity of this idea. Who can possibly have a greater interest in foreign trade than the trader himself—in other words the businessman? I know very well that in many countries bulk buying and bulk selling is the order of the day. This is not yet the case in Canada, and if we wish to retain the commanding position which we hold in the foreign trade field, we shall not allow these bulk transactions to become the common means of carrying on our trade.

I do not suggest for a moment that Canada's government trade service abroad is not doing an excellent job, because I know from personal experience that it is, but it is a job which must of necessity be limited in scope. It cannot undertake the actual work of trading. It cannot do the businessman's job for him. Similarly, in the sphere of foreign trade policy, I think that the businessman has the duty and should have the opportunity to make his views known. The importance of multilateral trade to the future of Canada is so great that we must tap all our resources of experience in the field of foreign trade in order to find an answer to this problem. Much can be done by officers of the government, but perhaps even more can be done at the business level.

Like almost every other country in the world, Canada is suffering from what is known as a U.S. dollar shortage. This is a convenient way of describing the fact that Canada buys more from the United States than she sells, and that the money which she receives from other countries—pounds sterling, are not convertible into U.S. dollars to pay for the goods that we are buying from the States. This is, of course, an over-simplification, and does not point up the possible avenues of attack on the problem. Why can't we sell more goods in the United States? Well, for one reason, the United States tariffs in many cases, despite recent reductions, are still too high to allow competition. Another hindrance is the way the United States handles its customs administration, where uncertainty as to rate of duty and delay in getting goods through the customs often makes it impractical, if not impossible, for the businessman to ship his goods to that market. These two matters are, of course, subjects for government action, but they are also subjects on which businessmen should make their views known. They are subjects which deserve the close study of businessmen and I may say they are receiving this study, not only by The Canadian Chamber of Commerce but by The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The other large trade matter in which we are vitally concerned, is the economic state of the United Kingdom. Not only do we have strong traditional political ties with that country and with the other members of the Commonwealth, but we have equally strong commercial ties. For many years, as all of us know, the Commonwealth countries and the United Kingdom in particular, were our best customers. In those days, of course, the United Kingdom was a creditor nation. She received returns on her investments throughout the world. Her merchant marine and other services brought in large amounts of money. Her colonial Empire produced goods which were sold in the dollar area and around the globe. In those days, the excess sterling which we received because we sold more goods to the United Kingdom than she sold to us was easily balanced off, and pounds sterling could be converted into U.S. dollars to buy what we wanted from the United States.

Following the war, the United Kingdom presented a very different picture. In the prosecution of the conflict, she had emptied her treasury. Her investments were largely gone. Many of the natural resources of her Colonial Empire were no longer available. She was now a debtor nation. In August 1939, the external liabilities of the United Kingdom amounted only to four hundred and seventy-six million pounds. In June of 1945, this had risen to three billion, three hundred and fifty-five million pounds—an increase of almost two billion, nine hundred million pounds. Her gold and dollar reserves had fallen off, her productive capacity in many cases has become obsolete or worn out. Here was a problem not only for the United Kingdom but for the democratc world.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce became concerned with the situation at its inception. During the last two years, this organization has sent several missions to the United Kingdom to study and discuss their problems at first hand. These meetings with British businessmen have resulted in the formation of an international committee through which Canadian and British businessmen strive to find answers to some of the difficult problems which are now slowing up trade and economic development for the two countries.

In doing this the Canadian Chamber had a good precedent in a committee which it has maintained for the past 15 years with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This international group of businessmen has been successful in helping to solve many economic problems common to Canada and the United States. Over a period of years, it has considered a great many subjects. It has of course, an obvious interest in trade matters, but there are other topics which are perhaps not so obvious—for example, the joint mobilization of the industrial defence forces of the North American Continent. Businessmen in Canada and the United States are very directly concerned in this matter because modern war has become, to a large degree, a conflict of production and of technical development. It is very important that businessmen in Canada and the United States should have some common meeting place where they can talk over the problems of joint defence and see what needs to be done.

During the past three years, this Committee has paid particular attention to the matter of Customs Administration between Canada and the United States, and it has been successful in bringing this important subject more into the public eye. Another subject in which the Committee is currently very interested is the development of Canadian and United States natural resources, and the most efficient use of them for the welfare of the North American Continent.

With the experience of this Committee in mind, the Canadian Chamber went ahead and set up a similar Committee with its opposite numbers in the United Kingdom. We found British businessmen very interested in the idea and already a number of meetings have been held. The Committee meets twice a year, once in Canada and once in the United Kingdom, and between times the secretariats in London and Montreal carry on the work of the group. I have just returned from a meeting of the Committee in London, where we had some very worthwhile talks. You may be interested in hearing some of the resolutions which emerged from the meeting.

First of all, the Committee came out strongly for making every effort to promote a return of international trade to a multilateral basis. We realize that this is only a goal which will not be easily achieved in the near future, but in view of the prevalance of bilateral and barter deals on the European Continent since the end of the war, it is worth noting that this group, representing British businessmen, is still eager to return to a multilateral basis.

As a result of the meetings, a resolution has been presented to The Canadian Chamber of Commerce urging that there should be a settlement of sterling indebtedness incurred by the United Kingdom during the war and, if necessary, Canada should be prepared to consider joining other wartime allies in assuming responsibility for a part of this indebtedness. After all, these debts were incurred by the United Kingdom in fighting a desperate war for democracy, and they should not now be a millstone around their necks, retarding British progress toward better things. Even if we look at the situation selfishly, we will see that Britain's sterling balance situation is a big factor in hindering a return to convertibility of dollars and sterling, which is affecting us very directly.

Another resolution presented to the Canadian Chamber as a result of our study of the British situation, concerns trading incentives. We must face the fact that for a British firm which has traditionally done business in the sterling area, and has never tried to meet sharp competition of United States and Canadian markets, there must be some incentive for it to really get into the fight, to raise those United States and Canadian dollars which the United Kingdom needs so badly. If a British firm sells goods in Canada or the States, it does not receive dollars. It receives sterling, just as if it had sold goods in the far less demanding, but high-priced markets of Europe. The Chamber of Commerce now urges two things to help remedy this situation: First, that British exporters to Canada be allowed to retain exclusively for their own use, a portion of the dollars received from their sales to Canada; and Second, that Canadian enterprises which have national distributing organizations and which are willing to undertake the merchandising of goods in the dollar area, be allowed to export their own products to sterling areas to the extent of 25% of the sterling imports which they sell. We believe that this would give quite an impetus to trade between Canada and the United Kingdom.

When we say that we believe the British businessman needs an incentive, we do not for one moment question his initiative or his industry on behalf of his country, but it has been shown that everywhere in the world, even in the countries behind the Iron Curtain, more things get done if there is a concrete reward for doing them. This is only human nature.

The Committee also talked about joint defence, and as a result The Canadian Chamber is making a strong plea for industrial integration for defence between the United States and the nations of the British Commonwealth. In so doing, of course, we are restating our belief and support for the North Atlantic pact.

You may have noticed that most of the subjects which I mentioned as being discussed by Canada and the United States Committee were also studied and discussed by the Anglo-Canadian Trade Committee. Whenever we start to study these subjects, we find that it is practically impossible to discuss Canada's relationship to the United Kingdom as something separate from her relationship to the United States.

As a result, we now hope to go a step further and to establish a three-way committee representing businessmen in Canada, United States and the United Kingdom. Such a Committee would be in a position to tackle a lot of those problems which involve the three countries. With the experience of our other Committees to guide us, I think there is a lot of useful work that we could do. We plan to go ahead with this project in the near future, and I think that we will receive the support of businessmen in the three countries.

There are so many things which concern the three of us. Defence for one thing—our industrial potential as well as our military planning. We in Canada must spare no effort to achieve the closest possible understanding and co-operation with these other two great countries, which are the main bulwark for the defence of democracy in the world. Our three countries speak a common language, have common traditions, are a great force for good in the world and must remain so. We face a heavy challenge today. If these challenges are effectively met, the world holds out a bright future for us. It is true the advance of science and technology has produced many new techniques of war, and it is important that our country and these other two great countries should lead the world in this field—but science and medicine have also produced many new techniques and developments for peace-time use.

If we remain strong, if we remain devoted to our ideals, the world of tomorrow will be a happy place. Now is the testing time. We must work together today. The great English-speaking nations of the world must co-operate to defeat their common enemies, to achieve their common goals. This co-operation must be achieved on every level—among the diplomats, the civil servants, among the businessmen, the soldiers, the writers and publicists, the men and women who make up our populations. By concerted effort we can achieve the goals we have set for ourselves. What is needed now is initiative, understanding and, above all, a spirit of co-operation.

"DEMOCRACY BEGINS AT HOME"

AN ADDRESS BY

M. GRATTAN O'LEARY

ASSOCIATE EDITOR, OTTAWA JOURNAL

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. SYDNEY HERMANT

Thursday, March 16th, 1950

MR. HERMANT:

Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada:

We are to have a special treat to-day. We are to hear an Address by Mr. M. Grattan O'Leary, Vice-Pres. and Associate Editor of the Ottawa Journal.

Born on the Gaspé Coast, Mr. O'Leary spent two years at Sea before entering the field of Journalism with the St. John Standard. He has been a Member of the Parliamentary Press Gallery for more than 20 years, and is one of 10 Canadian Journalists whose name is carved in stone in the Hall of Fame in the Parliament Buildings in Ottawa.

He has been the Ottawa correspondent of The Times of London, has contributed to British, United States and Canadian Magazines, and was Canadian Editor of Collier's. He has attended Imperial and International Conferences in London, Washington, and Canberra, and was at the Potsdam Conference at the close of the War. He has taken an active interest in public affairs having contested the Federal Riding of Gaspé in the General Election of 1925.

In 1948, as Convening Chairman of the Progressive-Conservative National Convention in Ottawa, he delivered the keynote speech which, may I say without departing from the traditional impartiality of this Club, was a magnificent one.

Mr. O'Leary is a full-time citizen who practises what he preaches, and it is a particular pleasure to welcome him to this meeting and to ask him to speak to us now on the subject "Democracy Begins at Home".

Mr. O'Leary:

Distinguished Guests and Gentlemen: I think it is thirteen years since you last invited me to speak to you, and I take it that the fact of your having asked me back again shows how time can heal most anything.

This is St. Patrick's—the Eve of St. Patrick's Day—as I am reminded by this snake here on the table before me. There were times in days gone by when the eve of St. Patrick's Day brought speeches from people like myself which I fear very greatly would not be acceptable to the members of the Empire Club. So I shall skirt St. Patrick's Day by merely remarking that the world in which we find ourselves is not unlike the world of St. Patrick. In his day, as in our own, the world was threatened by a barbarian horde from almost precisely the same direction, and it is for us to determine in our threatened world whether we can devise ways of meeting the threat, as the schools and the churches and the missionaries and the educationists met the crisis of his time.

Mathew Arnold, in one of his most memorable lines, spoke of standing "between two worlds, one dead, and the other struggling to be born", and what we seem to be witnessing at this time is a world, a new world struggling to be born, a new world taking on such fearful shapes and aspects that men truly are afraid, and whereever you go in this land at this time, wherever you go on this continent, or in Europe, you will meet people, ordinary folk, who will ask what it is they can do—"What is it we can do", they are asking, "to avert the tragedy, the moral nihilism which seem to be hemming us in?"

In all humility—because only in humility could one approach questions of that character—in all humility I am going to try to suggest one or two things which I do believe all of us can do usefully at this time.

There is a word which is on our lips almost eternally, the word "DEMOCRACY". I would be the last person in the world to believe, or to hold that we in Canada should give up to a narrow nationalism, but I do believe the time has come in this country when all of us should try to realize that Democracy begins at home. We may join the Atlantic Pact, we may become members of the United Nations, we may subscribe to all sorts and manners of international agreements and alliances, but the measure of our achievement in bringing help to Europe, or bringing help to the world, will and must be the level of our achievement at home. We shall make a precious small contribution towards setting Europe's house in order unless we first show a capacity to set in order our own.

Democracy in our day, democracy is not the thing that men and money and machines built up in the eighteenth century and called Democracy, and democracy today is challenged and imperilled as never before in its history. And, gentlemen, the peril to democracy, the challenge to our so-called "free way of life" does not come from Communism alone. I sometimes am inclined to believe, certainly am inclined to fear, that what has become known as "big government"—big government and the welfare state, that these things and democracy can not exist side by side. I shall hope to develop that idea in a more general way later on; but, in the meantime, it is not enough in our time—it is not enough in our time for a man to say, "I am not a Communist", it is not enough for him to say, "I am a democrat": he must be able to say, "I am a practitioner of democracy", "I am a practicing democrat", and he must be able to say that while knowing that democracy is a thing never done, that it is something one must keep doing all through his life.

And I sometimes wonder myself, watching the Parliamentary scene, and listening to the deputations and delegations which come to Parliament asking this, that and the other thing, I sometimes wonder whether all of our people, all of us who call ourselves democrats, all of us who say that we believe in the Parliamentary, the Representative system of Government, whether we truly understand what these things are about.

When you speak of "big government" in this country, when you speak of the difficulty of Socialism, of State Socialism of the Welfare State, of Big Government with its $2 and $3 billion budgets, when you speak of the difficulty of reconciling free democracy as our fathers knew it, with things like that, you invariably are told, "So long as we have the right to vote, everything must be well." Gentlemen, the right to vote about which we hear so much, in itself and by itself, may mean absolutely nothing at all. Unless we be able to compel Parliaments and Legislatures and government to do the things for which we vote, then our vote means no more than the vote they had last Sunday in Russia. It is the consequence of voting that counts, not the vote itself. And I often am saddened by the fact that those who in our elections are loudest in demanding that people get out and vote, those Service Clubs, those organizations, those Community Groups that go about shouting to people to get out and vote, and then forget all about what was voted for, and lose all interest in Parliaments and Legislatures themselves.

And one other thing that astonishes anybody watching government in this country is the fact that so many people seem to forget what our system is about. Our system is the Parliamentary system. We may meet in conventions, we may meet in gatherings such as this, we may pass resolutions, we may hear exhortations, we may hold the highest aspirations and ideals, but before these things can be translated into fact, become realities, somebody, under our system, must pass a law. That law will be passed by a Parliament or a Legislature, or a Council. And that law will be no better and no wiser than the men who write it. And hence the meaning, if our system is to mean anything at all, is that all of us see to it that we send to our Parliaments and our Legislatures the best hearts, and the best minds, and the best consciences which our country can provide.

And then in alertness, in understanding, what democracy means, their realizations, not in itself but the consequences of the vote, in that realization, giving those people an opportunity of carrying on the government of the country in a reasonably good way. I know how difficult it is, I know the arguments that are made about the well-nigh impossibility of the average citizen knowing what is going on in the government everywhere, all the time. It is not possible for the average Canadian to know what is going on in Ottawa and Washington and Moscow, and here and there and everywhere.

But this is possible and this is absolutely necessary if our democracy is to survive: it is that we do try to create in our country a pattern of public thought, a framework of morality, and that within that pattern of public thought, within that framework of morality, we do try to secure the best men in our country for our Parliaments and Legislatures—see to it afterwards as best we may, that they do carry out the things, at least the general principles for which we voted. Only in that way, in my judgment, can democracy in this country function, or in fact survive.

Now I agree with you, because I know you must be thinking this, that what I have outlined in a very loose and general way, what I have outlined presupposes a higher degree of public education than what we now possess: and that is absolutely true. Gentlemen, we keep telling ourselves that we have the greatest educational system in the world, and I am afraid that that is not quite true and that there is a danger of it becoming less true under existing trends. I am speaking, I suppose, to a number of gentlemen who are engaged in business, and one criticism I would make of business men, as I observe and meet them, is their present tendency to extol above all else what they call "technical" education. Actually there is no such thing as technical education; and certainly there is a vast difference between technical instruction and education. God pity the country where everybody would be trained and nobody educated; and one has only to recall a scene that took place in a Court in London ten days ago to see what can happen with people who are trained, who are highly trained, who are highly trained as specialists, and who lack true education, and therefore are branded by a failure to understand moral principles. Technical education, technical instruction, and real education have nothing whatever to do with each other.

I would be the last person in the world to say that we should not train our young people, train them to enable them to achieve to a higher standard; but that, my friends, is not education in its true sense, and I think we are making a profound mistake in turning our universities into production lines for all sorts of occasions. And the danger of that trend is that we shall come to the position of some of the states of the Union—and in one of the greatest states of the Union today, the State University actually grants a degree on a paper written on the technique of dating. That has come to pass in some of the universities in the country to the south.

True education has nothing to do with technical training; in fact, it has very little to do with the highest instruction. I recently have been reading a book, "The God That Failed"—in which six so-called intellectuals tell of their trek to Moscow and the return—by Arthur Koestler,—Andre Gidé, Spengler, and so on. Not one of these men show that they possess the least bit of education, that they are intellectuals. What, I wonder, is an "intellectual?" Is an intellectual a man who becomes a Communist first by becoming a spy, by betraying his employer, by going into Russia and spending a year and taking money for which he did not work, for a book which he did not write, and then pretending to tell his readers that he had left the European way of life and gone to Russia because he said, he had lost faith in Western values and was seeking the kingdom of God, is seeking the kingdom of God by becoming a spy and taking money which he did not earn, and lost faith in Western values, when there was not a bit of evidence that he had ever lifted a hand to make Western values work. He is represented as a great intellectual! Actually he was a man without the least moral perception, without wisdom, without understanding.

And too much of our education is turned that way. Education in its true sense is TOLERANCE, it is UNDERSTANDING, it is SYMPATHY, it is SPORTSMANSHIP—and Henry James said without SPORTSMANSHIP THERE COULD BE NO DEMOCRACY. It is MERCY, it is PITY, and it is COMPASSION, and unless a man have these things, he is not truly educated. One of the disasters of our world is that it has become all sign posts and no destination, all specialization and no wisdom, all facts and no knowledge. We have forgotten the truth that there is no sense in pasting wings on a man unless you can give him a winged nature. We have forgotten that all of the good things which we say we should have from democracy and freedom can exist only, can endure only in a vitally Christian social state, and we have forgotten that there is no sense at all in trying to make men good by making them free when the real task is to make them good in order to fit them to be free.

That brings me to my final word, the word that no healing will come to our earth, no final good for mankind unless men make up their minds to get back to the eternal truths of religion. No one who goes to Europe today, no one who looks out over Europe's welter of hate and infidelity and unbelief, can conclude other than this, that the chief source of Europe's wrath is in Europe's forgetfulness of God. Four years ago I had the privilege, a rather sad privilege, of motoring some 1500 miles through Germany. I saw the horror and the devastation of Germany's cities, I saw the horror and the chaos of the German people, I met those wanderers on the highway, going God only knows where. But one thing in Germany I did not see, and that was any spirit of atonement, any understanding of the cause or the reasons which had brought such calamity upon them; and that forgetfulness of God, that infidelity, that spirit of atheism and defiance is, after all, not beyond understanding. For more than two centuries all the so-called great intellectuals of Europe told the people over there that

Christianity did not matter, that faith was outmoded, that Christianity was in fact the babble of contemptible slaves,—we shall make our own articles and tripods and gods. And they did. They asked the people of Europe to desert and betray all that their fathers had taught them—they throned their gold deities on their empty altars, and at the end sowed the seeds which came to their flowering in pagan Germany and now has come to our forefront in the godlessness of Communist Russia.

This was written a few years ago by one of our greatest living philosophers, Jacques Maritain, who, looking into our world with all its tragedies, fears and plans, said that "any plan which falls below the heart of Christ is doomed to disapointment."

That, Gentlemen, is the challenge of our day. If that challenge be not met, if our world be unable to get a moral equivalent for the atomic bomb, then despair must have a last word.

"THE METROPOLITAN PROBLEM"

An Address By

ERIC HARDY

Director, Bureau of Municipal Research, Toronto

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, March 23rd, 1950

Mr. Hermant:

Members and Guests of the Empire Club of Canada: We are to hear an Address to-day by Eric Hardy, Director of the Bureau of Municipal Research. The Bureau is an independent fact-finding organization reporting to the Public on Civic Affairs in Greater Toronto. Mr. Hardy is also director of the Bureau's companion organization, the Citizens' Research Institute of Canada, which collects, interprets, and publishes facts with the aim of promoting effective Government at every level. In welcoming Mr. Hardy to our Club to-day we are expressing appreciation to the Bureau and the Institute for the fine contribution that they are making to the Community at large. Eric Hardy succeeded Dr. Britain in his present post three years ago, coming directly from the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, Ottawa, where he headed the Research section of the Supply Division. He was engaged by the Bureau of Statistics and Research of the Ontario Government to undertake special work with respect to their participation in the 1945-46 Dominion-Provincial Conference. It is a particular pleasure for me to introduce Mr. Hardy who is a classmate and personal friend. He is an Honour Graduate from University College in the University of Toronto, in Political Science, and is presently giving a special series of lectures there on local government. He is going to speak to us now on a subject with which he is thoroughly familiar and on which he is recognized as an outstanding and impartial authority—"The Metropolitan Problem". Mr. Eric Hardy.

MR. HARDY:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Empire Club:

It is a particular pleasure and honour for me to be here today to address the club because, as Mr. Hermant has said, he is an old friend, and I see a number of old friends among the audience, and I am glad that they are here.

Mr. Hermant did not tell you that he is himself on the Council of the Bureau of Municipal Research, and is making an outstanding contribution to our work.

The Metropolitan Problem is a subject which I should have tackled somewhat differently had I been asked to speak here a matter of two or three months ago. But there has been, as most of you in this room will realize, a good deal of discussion and press comment on the subject, and while some months ago many were wondering 'What is the Metropolitan Problem', and 'What is this Amalgamation all about', people now are much more familiar with the problem and are much more concerned in trying to size up in their own minds the relative merits of different schemes of co-ordinating the local government functions in the area of Greater Toronto.

A metropolitan area is different from an ordinary small urban community. A metropolitan area somewhat resembles a spider web. It has a central city, or perhaps twin cities in the centre, and branching out from it, a number of satellite communicities; but we call the whole area a metropolitan area because it is a region through which urban development has become continuous. The spaces between the suburban communities have filled up with residential commercial and industrial sites, and rural land has disappeared almost entirely from what we describe as the metropolitan area.

Most of you can look back and think of the time when on the west of Toronto, the Kingsway area included much open country, and you have seen that section and other sections filling up very rapidly. The whole area around Toronto is changing and growing and that growth is not likely to stop: Toronto is destined to become a much larger and much more important city than it is today. In the process of growth, the suburban municipalities become linked ever more closely with the affairs of the city proper, and throughout the metropolitan area there is a continuous shuttle movement as people travel back and forth from their homes to their work. Some ten years ago in London, England, it was estimated that one person in every ten earns his living in helping to cart the others around. The paid services in Toronto might not bulk so large, but people serving the Toronto Transportation Commission, the other transportation authorities throughout the area, the taxi drivers, and also take account of the amount of time spent by people driving their private automobiles over long distances back and forth to work, I think you would find that one in ten man-hours is not far out of line for our own part of the country here.

The metropolitan area then is an area with common problems and common interests and it has been suggested that it is necessary in order to provide the best civic services for the area, that some at least of these need to be brought together.

Many of you have heard Mr. Gardiner, as Chairman of the Toronto and York Planning Board, discussing the need to tie in the water facilities of Toronto with the water supply for North York and for the other suburban municipalities. The same is true of sewage disposal, the same is true of police services. Certainly it would be helpful if, throughout the Toronto area, there were a common radio communication system linking the police forces so that criminals could be apprehended more speedily.

I could go on and develop for you arguments suggesting the value of linking together all the major services that the local government is called upon to provide. Take Education, for example: the location of school buildings can best be accomplished when these buildings are spotted throughout the whole area of urban development in line with population needs of that whole area.

And so there has come to be, I think, in many circles, recognition of this need to have some form of metropolitan government embracing a larger or smaller share of the local government functions.

The City of Toronto has made application to the Ontario Municipal Board for an amalgamation of 11 municipalities and parts of two others. This to my mind is the best method of bringing the metropolitan area together, and this is the minimum area which must be considered for a fundamental change in the governmental structure.

We need beyond this area a broad planning control embracing at least 23 municipalities, and the time will come in the future when the form of government, the amalgamated government, which is I believe a worthwhile goal, will not only have to cover 11 municipalities and parts of two more but will need again to be extended.

Not everyone is in favor of amalgamation, although more and more people are coming to give their support to a linking of at least some services—into a borough system, a county scheme of government or unification.

From the point of view of administration, the arguments in favor of amalgamation, that is of complete unification, seem to me to be patent and obvious. We have an excellent example of how in one important piece of work the need of Toronto and the suburbs to operate together has already been recognized. I am referring to the Toronto Industrial Commission. Since 1929 that body has been organized to encourage the entry of new industry into the whole Toronto area. It obtains half its money from the city proper, and half from the suburbs and from industries located outside the City boundaries. This may not be a perfectly fair splitting of the costs, but the obvious advantages of having adequate funds have been recognized. The Toronto Industrial Commission is able to supply information in answer to enquiries from London, England, from New York, from

Chicago, and from many centres outside of Ontario and outside of Canada.

I want to pay tribute to Mr. C. L. Burton, a member of this Club, and who would have been at the head table if it were not necessary for him to be out of town. Mr. Burton as the then President of the Toronto Board of Trade was very largely instrumental in fostering the development of the Toronto Industrial Commission. I believe that no one who is interested in promoting the industrial growth of the Toronto area will regret the action that he was able to accomplish at that time.

The main obstacle to amalgamation, as I see it, is political, and I don't use that term entirely disparagingly. It is a problem of people and how people should organize their local governments. We have actually an example that goes back many years, of an amalgamation that was proposed covering a larger population, and a very considerable area. In London, England, in 1837, a Royal Commission appointed by the Central Government came out flatly in favor of an amalgamation, a full fledged amalgamation, to embrace a population of 1½ million people. Now if in 1837, with transportation facilities much less developed than they are today, that Royal Commission could contemplate an amalgamation embracing 1½ million people, surely we in the Toronto area today can contemplate an amalgamation which will enlarge the population to approximately 1 million people!

Now it is plainly easier for people living within Toronto proper, and people connected with the government of the city proper, to face the prospect of amalgamation than for those living in the suburbs. People in Long Branch and Swansea, comparatively small municipalities, naturally are likely to have more doubts about what will happen to them if amalgamation comes about. But I would remind the residents of these municipalities and other suburban municipalities that in the amalgamation scheme presently proposed the population of Toronto proper would have added to it an additional half of its present numbers. Toronto, with a population of

670,000 people, would add approximately 330,000, therefore, I cannot see that the suburban municipalities will be swamped by the union with the City of Toronto. Nor is it fair to describe this proposed change as annexation.

There have been annexations in the past. The City of Toronto has annexed land and people to its territories about 45 times in its history, and the last major annexation was accomplished without any opposition whatsoever—for at that time they brought in Mount Pleasant Cemetery.

But with the speeding of transportation facilities, with the shortening of the working day, people are able to live much further from their work than in the past, and the population can fan out farther; people can settle in what have been independent communities, with their own centres of existence, of separate existence, and that has meant that annexations have not come about easily and automatically. It has required a good deal of salesmanship to convince even the present number of supporters, to convince the present Council of the City of Toronto, that amalgamation is a useful and a forward step.

Those living outside the boundaries of the city proper have in particular, been concerned with the question of Costs, and they have every reason to be concerned. One factor affecting the cost is that in a metropolitan area some of the suburbs may be what we call "dormitory" suburbs, that is, largely residential-like Forest Hill Village or Swansea—and others may be heavily industrial centres—like Leaside and New Toronto. With real property as the present major source of municipal revenues, and with real property likely to continue as the major source of local government funds, an industrial community like Leaside will find no immediate advantage from amalgamation. They may be called upon to pay a larger share of the total costs of local government throughout the whole area; and if they are called upon to pay a larger share, in my opinion it is because they should be doing so now!

Some of you will remember the experience of municipalities in the depression years with the relief problem. Certainly I hope that the municipalities will not again be asked to saddle such a large bill for relief as they had to at that time. During the depression I was not living within Toronto, but I did hear certain people suggesting that Forest Hill Village was perhaps getting off lightly. And in the presence of the former Reeve of Forest Hill Village I am prepared to say: I hope such inequities of taxation will be ironed out in amalgamation, and let the chips fall where they may!

The suburban municipalities have another reason to be concerned, and with some of them it is very genuine. Some of them have built up real assets, buildings and municipal assets generally of which they have very good reason to be proud; and if they have taxed more heavily in the past, and if they have operated with greater efficiency in the past, I think those economies ought to be recognized in the event that amalgamation takes place. But that recognition can be given much more fairly by an impartial referee than by trying to honour all the claims of all the individual municipalities which are being put forward at the present time. If amalgamation comes about there is an impartial referee to deal with this question, and that referee is the Ontario Municipal Board. If they wish, the board can bring in experts to assist them in the job of arriving at the financial settlement. But surely, if the City of Toronto with its very substantial assets, is prepared to entrust the allocation to an impartial referee, such as the Ontario Municipal Board, the smaller municipalities haven't too much to fear.

Another question which has worried people, both within and without the city proper, is the question of local autonomy. Concern has been expressed especially from the suburbs. We have heard it said that local autonomy is threatened by the suggestion that we have a full-fledged amalgamation. Not many people are saying that local autonomy is threatened by any or every metropolitan authority. They are recognizing that some form of metropolitan authority is inevitable. But they do say: "let us preserve as much of our independence as we can and only join together those services which it is absolutely necessary to link up." Yet when you come to consider the services which need to be joined, it is very difficult to draw a line which leaves a substantial portion of the job of local government outside.

Mimico has made an application to the Municipal Board for an interurban service area, and they have suggested that certain services be linked. They have suggested there should be common control of education, of transportation, of the main highways, of water, sewage disposal, health and welfare. About the only things that I can think of that they have left out are parks—and there we can see the need of a metropolitan authority to take some interest in parks designed to preserve a green belt around the heart of the city—and the other thing that has been left out in Mimico's suggested allocation of services is local roads and streets. But, even there, it is possible to picture a situation where an authority, an independent authority, charged with the control of local roads and streets, might come into conflict with another authority charged with the development of an adequate network of main traffic arteries.

As I see it, if any substantial share of the local services are left in independent hands, the existence of these separate Councils not subject to the control of the metropolitan authority can threaten proper metropolitan planning—not by a failure to co-operate but by failure to co-operate sufficiently quickly, to co-operate with expedition.

Those living in the suburbs and speaking about local autonomy might also examine the voting record in their own municipalities and compare it with the voting record in a large city like Toronto. In the latest year in which there was a contest for the chief municipal office, in the suburban municipalities on the average only 27.4% of the eligible voters turned out at the polls; and in Toronto's election in January 1950, the turn-out was 52.8%. Now you will quickly think of the special issues that entered into the Toronto election this year, and say that that is the explanation of Toronto's heavy vote. And it is an explanation in part, but only in part—because in recent years Toronto's record generally has been better than the suburban record, and Toronto has consistently been ahead of certain suburbs in its voting record.

There is however a problem of local autonomy; and it seems to me that the way to solve that problem is to develop local autonomy within the local government structure which is appropriate to the physical job which must be done. To my mind the physical job of administering services calls for an amalgamation of Greater Toronto.

With the amalgamation of Greater Toronto, the Council, the newly-elected Council, not an extension of Toronto's government but a new government representing a new and greater city, is better equipped to keep costs under control, and such a government can achieve the real economies that amalgamation will bring.

But there is no need for citizens to turn to indepedent authorities to achieve adequate participation in the local government of the area. The citizens have today channels through which they can make their voices heard, channels which are not fully utilized.

In a large city we must develop strong ward associations. We must develop neighborhood associations, which will give serious consideration to the needs of each particular section. Home and school groups can be of material assistance. It is not necessary that people exercise independent authority for them to exert a real influence on the nature of the administration of their schools. One active Home and School Association can certainly make its voice heard with the Board of Education, and the same goes for neighborhood Associations, in bringing the other problems of local government before the council.

Today we must all be prepared to recognize the job that needs to be done in a great metropolis. Someone has said that you would create a monstrosity by amalgamating the city proper with the suburbs. Well, if it is a monstrosity, it is already with us, and we must make the best of it in governing this very large urban area. The important point is that all people living within this urban area can make a great contribution to its government.

People have only scratched the surface in making their wishes felt to their elected representatives, not only at election time but between elections, and through the Neighborhood Associations people can exert an influence on government which is legitimate and constructive, and one which does not feed on divided jurisdiction.

"EXERCISE SWEETBRIAR"

An Address By

OMOND McKILLOP SOLANDT,
O.B.E., M.A., D.Sc., M.D., M.R.C.P., F.R.S.C.
Chairman, Defence Research Board, Ottawa, Ont.

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, March 30th, 1950

Mr. Hermant:

Members and Guests of The Empire Club of Canada: We are to hear an Address to-day by Dr. O. M. Solandt, O.B.E., Chairman of the Defence Research Board, Ottawa. Born in Winnipeg, Dr. Solandt moved to Toronto where his Father was the head of the United Church Publishing House. He graduated in Medicine as Gold Medalist from the University of Toronto, where he played on the Senior Intercollegiate Football Team. Dr. Solandt then spent two years doing Post Graduate Research under Dr. C. H. Best in the Dept. of Physiology. He also undertook further Research at Cambridge University, and at the London Hospital, England. In January, 1941, he was appointed Director of the Medical Research Council Physiological Laboratory at the Armoured Fighting Vehicle School. He was later appointed Superintendent of the Army Operational Research Group with the Rank of Colonel. In 1945 he was selected as Director of the Operational Research Division South-East Asia Command. At the end of the War he was immediately appointed by the War Office as a Member of the Military Mission sent to Japan to evaluate the effects of the atomic Bomb. For his distinguished service he was awarded the O.B.E. in the King's Birthday Honours List in 1946, and the United States Medal of Freedom with Bronze Palm in 1947. As Chairman of the Defence Research Board he is the scientific member of the Chiefs of Staff Committee and the Defence Council. All Canadians and particularly those of us who are Graduates of our great University of Toronto are proud of Dr. Solandt and we are greatly indebted to him for his devotion to the Cause of our Empire and our Country. He was personally present at "Exercise Sweetbriar" just concluded, and is going to speak to us on that subject to-day.

DR. SOLANDT:

As I shall explain in a moment, I am speaking to you today on "Exercise Sweetbriar" in the place of the Honourable Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence, who is attending the meeting of North Atlantic Defence Ministers at The Hague. I know that if Mr. Claxton were here, he would begin his account of this joint Exercise by paying tribute to the memory of the late Laurence Steinhardt, the United States Ambassador to Canada.

Mr. Steinhardt was Mr. Claxton's guest on the visit to "Sweetbriar" that I shall describe. As always, he was the "life of the party". He was a man of boundless energy, insatiable curiosity, great intelligence and irresistible personal charm. You all know of his accomplishments as a lawyer and a diplomat, but only those who had the privilege of knowing him personally realize what a really great man he was. He devoted his whole energy and intelligence to each job that he undertook. "Exercise Sweetbriar" was no exception. He met more people and learned more about them and their jobs than did any other observer on the Exercise and yet he did it all in a simple, direct, friendly way that won every heart. He always preferred to be called Larry, or Laurence, rather than Your Excellency.

Since 1933, he had represented the United States in some of the most troubled parts of the world. In every post his complete devotion to duty, his vast knowledge and his vibrant personality overcame all difficulties. He not only served his own country well, but also did a great deal to improve international relations and to support freedom and democracy throughout the world.

When he came to Canada, he concentrated on getting to know us and our problems. Within a few months he became one of the ablest and best informed exponents of the Canadian point of view and he vigorously expounded it to Washington.

His tragic death is a sad loss to his family and his friends; to Canada and the United States and to the cause of freedom throughout the world. In these troubled times, we can ill-afford to lose a man with such vast experience, broad tolerance and genuine effective interest in world affairs. He will be greatly missed by his family and friends and by all who worked with him or came under the influence of his dynamic personality.

A short time ago, your President approached the Honourable Brooke Claxton, Minister of National Defence, to see if he would address this Club on the subject of "Exercise Sweetbriar". Unfortunately for you, Mr. Claxton had to go to Europe to attend a meeting of the North Atlantic Defence Ministers. He therefore suggested that one of the Chiefs of Staff should substitute for him. General Foulkes, the Chief of the General Staff and Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff Committee, has gone to Europe with the Minister; Air Marshal Curtis, the Chief of the Air Staff, has been on Sick Leave; Admiral Grant, the Chief of the Naval Staff, was not directly concerned with, and did not visit "Exercise Sweetbriar", and therefor, your invitation was passed on to me.

I have mentioned this, not to complain of having the the task passed to me, because I consider it a very great honour, but to emphasize to you that "Exercise Sweetbriar" was an Exercise to test Canadian and United States Armed Forces in the field under sub-Arctic conditions, and was not, except in a very minor way, a research project. It will naturally suggest a good many subjects for research and much of the information derived from it will be of value to research workers, but research was not the primary object of any part of the Exercise.

I am therefore speaking to you today, not as Chairman of the Defence Research Board, but merely as an official of the Department of National Defence, who had the good fortune to attend a part of the Exercise and has therefore been called on to speak to you in the absence of the Minister.

I must also warn you that I am speaking to you, more as an observer of the Exercise, than as a scientist. Scientists are quite rightly expected to deal only with facts. In this case, many of the most important facts are not yet available. They will not be available until the reports of observers are completely available and have been fully analyzed. I am therefore giving you, in many cases, personal opinions, instead of facts. I have checked the opinions as carefully as I can and think that they are correct, but you must realize that none of them can be regarded as the final word; only the facts count in matters of this kind.

Since most of you will already have read a good deal about the Exercise, I will not bore you with a detailed description of it. I shall merely give a brief outline of the main features of the Exercise in order to refresh your memory, and will then go on to a more detailed consideration of a few of the lessons that came out of the Exercise.

The main object of the Exercise was to develop doctrine and procedures for the employment of combined Canadian and U.S. forces operating in the sub-Arctic, and to test in the field the latest developments in clothing, food, aircraft, vehicles, weapons and other equipment and material. It also provided a most important opportunity for gaining experience in joint and combined planning and in truly integrated Canada-United States and Army-Air Force Command.

The Exercise began on February 13th and concluded on February 23rd. Over 5,000 personnel of the United States and Canadian Armies and Air Forces took part, nearly one-half being Canadians. The tactical assumption was that an Aggressor force had captured the airfield at Northway in Alaska, and had moved down the Northwest Highway, almost the whole three hundred and fifty miles to Whitehorse. The task of the Allied Force was to drive the Aggressor back and recapture Northway. In preparation for the Exercise, the great majority of 1,457 Canadian Army personnel had trained at Wainwright, under even more severe conditions than those prevailing during the Exercise. The period of training covered about seven weeks. The actual Exercise lasted for eleven days and during the whole of this period, the troops lived out under severe winter conditions. Some idea of the size and complexity of the operation is given by the fact that more than 978 motor vehicles and 100 aircraft took part in it.

Before going on to a brief narrative of the Exercise, a few words about geography may help you to understand the setting of the Exercise.

The terrain of Northern North America can be very approximately divided into two types of country; the true Arctic, north of the tree-line, including both the Arctic barrens and the mountain ranges of the Eastern Arctic, and the sub-Arctic treed area, which again, includes both the treed plain of Northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories and the mountainous regions of Northern British Columbia, the Yukon and Southern Alaska. The problems of living and moving in the different types of terrain are very different. Life in the treed areas is never as difficult as life in the barrens, since a certain degree of shelter is always available and the trees supply fuel. On the other hand, movement in the treed areas may be much more difficult than in the barrens.

The whole of "Exercise Sweetbriar" took place in the treed area of the sub-Arctic, between the ranges of the Rocky Mountains. It is an area of extremely low temperatures, but comparatively light winds. The airfield at Snag, which is in the northern part of the area covered by the Exercise, achieved the lowest recorded temperature of –81° F. in February, 1947. In considering the effects of northern weather on military operations, it is important to remember that men and machines do not always react similarly to cold. Under ordinary outdoor conditions, man supplies his own heat. He is therefore more sensitive to rate of heat loss than to actual temperature. Heat loss is greatly accelerated by a wind, so that a man may be much more uncomfortable in a high wind at 20° below zero than he is with no wind at 50 below zero. Machines that are not producing heat behave just oppositely. They are more affected by a temperature at 50° below than one of 20°, and are not much affected by wind. It is therefore to be expected that warfare among the mountains of the Yukon would be harder on machines, and less hard on men, than would warfare in the Arctic barrens. Experience on the Exercise in general supported this view, though both men and machines stood up extremely well to the conditions that were encountered.

The geographical setting of the Exercise was also unusual in that it lay along the only road system in North America that extends almost to the Arctic Circle, and that, throughout most of the Exercise area, the road traverses a defile in the mountains that sharply limits the rapid deployment of ground forces.

With this brief outline of geography and climate as a background, I shall now refresh your memory of the events of the Exercise by giving a short account of the adventures of Mr. Claxton's party during their visit to the area.

The party left Ottawa in an RCAF North Star at 11:00 a.m. Monday, February 20th. We stopped overnight in Edmonton and landed at Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory, the base of the Allied Forces in the Exercise, about noon on Tuesday, the 21st. We had then travelled over 2,700 miles from Ottawa. At Whitehorse we saw the Command Organization for the Allied Force and inspected Fighter, Bomber and Transport Units of both the U.S. and Canadian Air Forces. We also had discussions with Major General M.H.S. Penhale, General Officer Commanding of Western Command and Air Vice Marshal C. R. Dunlap, Air Officer Commanding of North West Air Command, who were directly responsible for the Canadian participation in the Exercise. The following day we flew to Northway, in Alaska, about 275 air miles to the northwest. There we visited the advanced Headquarters of the Aggressor force, learned their plans for the defence of the airfield, and inspected some of their troops, including anti-aircraft and radar units. We then crossed "No-Man's-Land" and drove back toward Whitehorse, along the Alaska Highway, stopping to inspect various units of the Allied Forces as we met them along the road. The first ones encountered were the infantry of the PPCLI and the gunners of the RCHA. They were deployed beside the road leading to the airfield at Northway, preparing for an attack the next day. The observer party had reached this point in the Exercise, after two days of extremely comfortable travel in well-heated aircraft. The troops of the PPCLI had reached it after a drive of nearly 1500 miles from Wainwright to Whitehorse, followed by ten days of stiff fighting up the 350 miles of highway from Whitehorse to Northway. During the whole of this period, they had slept and eaten in their tents, or in the open. All buildings were out of bounds to them. When we met them, it was a bright sunny day, with the temperature about 10 below zero. All the officers and men that we met and talked to were cheerful, alert and enthusiastic. They obviously had the upper hand in the struggle with their environment, and felt confident that they would be equally successful in the final battle with the Aggressor. From this point, we drove about one hundred miles back down the Highway to Camp O'Hara. During this drive, we stopped to talk to each Unit that we met, and so had the opportunity of brief discussions with an American Artillery Unit, equipped with 105 mm. field guns; with Units of Combat Team "A", U.S. Infantry, which was just starting a flanking movement through the bush to surround the airfield; and with the advanced headquarters, which was controlling both Army and Air operations. The twin Mustangs of the Aggressor Air Force, based in Fairbanks, also cooperated by making a low-level attack on our cars. Had this been a real attack in war, it would have greatly accelerated promotions in both the RCAF and the Canadian Army. During this drive down the Highway, I had the great good fortune to travel with Lieutenant General Chamberlin, the Commanding General of the Fifth U.S. Army, who was the overall Commander of the Exercise. Anyone who knows General Chamberlin, will know what a pleasant and informative companion he is. I am sure that his personal charm and competence were very considerable factors in effecting the excellent relationship between Canadian and U.S. forces, which was one of the outstanding features of the whole Exercise. As several cynics remarked, the cooperation between the two Air Forces or between the two Armies, was sometimes better than the relationships between the Army and Air Force of either country.

In such a complex and novel undertaking, there are bound to be important differences of opinion, which will sometimes lead to heated arguments. We were assured, and our own observations confirmed this assurance, that the lines for arguments were never drawn on a national basis. Each man supported his own view regardless of nationality.

When we had passed through the last of the attacking troops, General Chamberlin left us to return to Northway and Mr. Claxton's party continued down the Highway to Camp O'Hara. There, we were most comfortably fed and accommodated in a staging camp which had been prepared for use by the troops on their return journey from the Exercise. We were up early the next morning to drive to Snag Airfield and to fly from there to Northway, where we arrived in time to take up a position on the edge of a nearby lake to watch the parachute drop by "C" Company of Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry. This airborne attack was combined with artillery fire and enveloping infantry attacks in the final assault on the airfield at Northway.

It was a thrilling sight to see the Dakota transports of the RCAF approach in perfect formation and to watch the troops pile out in neat, close-packed sticks. It took little imagination to visualize the long months of training that led up to this apparently effortless perfection.

Soon after landing, the paratroops assembled and began their advance toward the hangar and the Aggressor camp on the edge of the airfield. Quite a few of the less experienced observers commented very unfavourably on the slackness of some of the men who just lay about on the ice and made no effort to join in the attack. It was a little embarrassing, but reassuring, to discover that these unfortunates had been declared dead by the umpires and were merely awaiting "burial".

The troops of the U.S. Combat Team "A" and of the PPCLI later attacked the outer defenses of the airfield as we watched from the roof of the hangar. Shortly before noon, the Exercise was declared over. Mr. Claxton then made a very brief, but extremely popular speech, in which he congratulated everyone on the conduct of the Exercise and announced the granting of an extra week's leave to all those who had participated.

The preparations that we saw at Northway and later at Whitehorse, for the termination of the Exercise, were almost as impressive as those for its conduct. The hangar at Northway had been prepared to house and feed up to 3000 men. It was completely equipped with showers and even had a PX. Arrangements had also been made to start the airlift of troops from Northway back to their bases in Canada and the United States within a few hours of the completion of the Exercise. By the time that we arrived back at Whitehorse, a fleet of four-engined transport aircraft had left for Northway, and before dark, more than eight hundred men had been flown out to Whitehorse, Edmonton and other dispersal points. Thus ended a most successful Exercise and a most enjoyable and informative trip for the observers.

As you will see, I have not attempted to review in detail the progress of the Exercise, but merely to sketch some of the highlights to refresh your memory. I will now go on to outline a few of the important lessons learned from the Exercise and a few problems that have arisen in the course of it. I must emphasize again that these lessons are not the official ones that will result from a careful study of all the reports, but are merely my personal views which are inevitably coloured by my own experience in science and also by my very brief visit to the Exercise. I feel quite sure that if I had actually lived with the Forces throughout the whole Exercise, my opinions would be much less definite and clear-cut. I am rather in the position of the man who has visited a strange country for three days; he can then write a book on the country with the greatest self-confidence, whereas if he had stayed for three months or three years, he would begin to be less certain about his conclusions and would probably write a much less interesting and much more informative book.

These comments on the lessons and problems of the Exercise take the form of a series of rather disconnected paragraphs, each dealing with a single main subject. This seems to be the only way of covering such a broad field in the time available.

The first conclusions deal with the general problems of the Exercise as a whole, the next deal more specifically with ground problems, and the last group with air problems.

The Exercise, as a whole, once again demonstrated the fact that the main problems of Arctic and sub-Arctic defence are human problems. Even quite experienced troops when first sent to the Arctic, lack confidence in their ability to beat the problems they encounter. If such men are sent away from their main base to undertake some military task, they will not succeed in their task, and may not even survive. They must first be specially trained and equipped to meet the entirely non-military hazards of their new environment. With moderately good training and equipment they will be able to survive in the Arctic in winter only if they concentrate during all their waking hours on the problems of providing food and shelter for themselves. If they are reasonably well equipped and trained, they will have a little time to spare for their military tasks. If they are superbly equipped and trained, are well led by officers in whom they have complete confidence, and if every moment of their time is carefully planned, they will then have quite a bit of time free from the main problem of existence to devote to their primary task of offensive or defensive fighting. Even at this stage, they will have to devote quite a bit of time, energy and a great deal of skill to solving the simple problems of living in the Arctic. It will therefore take them longer to accomplish any normal military task than would be the case in a less arduous climate. In War, the side which is able to devote the greatest proportion of its time to fighting, will win. Therefore, the basic problem of defence in the Arctic or sub-Arctic is to get the difficulties of eating, sleeping and travelling so well under control, that ample time is left in which to deal with the enemy. Even in a temperate climate, poorly trained or equipped soldiers may be fully occupied with the simple problems of living. In an Arctic climate, such troops would not survive, much less be able to fight. This importance of perfecting the technique of living in the Arctic is sometimes overlooked in a pre-occupation with the more glamourous problems of weapons, aircraft and vehicles for the Arctic. An important example of the importance of this outlook is seen in the case of Arctic clothing.

Troops must be trained to realize that their Arctic clothing is their own individual protection against climate hazards. They must see that it constitutes a complex machine which must be maintained and operated with care. They must learn how to control ventilation to avoid overheating during exercise, or overcooling during rest and to prevent the accumulation of ice. They must take every opportunity to dry their clothing and be sure that they adjust every item of personal equipment as carefully as they would a gun or radio set. There was every indication that the ground troops involved in "Exercise Sweetbriar" had successfully mastered these problems of living in the Arctic.

Many observers reported that, at the beginning of the Exercise, the Canadian troops were more confident of their ability to beat the weather than were the U.S. troops. This can certainly be attributed to the fact that the Canadian troops had, during their training at Wainwright, encountered temperatures down to 58° below zero. They knew they could survive such temperatures with reasonable comfort and so were very pleased with the more moderate 30° and 40° below temperatures encountered in the Yukon. The U.S. troops had unfortunately been unable to find such low temperatures in their training area in Colorado, and so they were at first uncertain of their ability to operate in temperatures of 40° below zero. They soon found that their training was sound and that these temperatures caused them no trouble.

I have emphasized the basic problems of living in the Arctic, because I think they are of primary importance to all Arms operating in the North. They are of less importance to the Air Force, than to the Army, since the Air Force will usually be operating from relatively large and reasonably well prepared bases. However, every member of the Air Force must be fully trained in the techniques of life in the Arctic, because at any moment, they may become essential to his survival.

The outstanding impression that a visitor to the Exercise received was a general one of quiet self-confidence and competence. Everyone that we met seemed sure of his knowledge and ability to deal with the problems that he was encountering. Every task that we saw performed was done competently, whether it was a long familiar task, such as flying an aeroplane, or driving a truck, or whether it was a novel task, such as planning and setting up defensive positions in deep snow. The fact that there were fewer real casualties from all causes, including frostbite, than is usual on Exercises on this scale in temperate climates, shows that this impression of competence was a correct one. Everyone really did know how to do his job and he did it enthusiastically and well.

The next general lesson of the Exercise was that air superiority is essential to ground operations in country of this sort. The ground forces were so road-bound that they were very vulnerable to daylight air attack. In areas where no roads exist, they would have to be made and the vulnerability to air attack would remain. In addition, the bases from which ground attacks can be launched in the North will always be relatively small and isolated and hence open to effective bombing by comparatively small forces. Many observers therefore concluded that most operations in the North should be carried out entirely by air, using paratroops, air transported ground units and air transport of all supplies. This again implies complete air superiority and further emphasizes the need for first-class long-range all-weather fighters for operation in the North. A few observers felt that enemy fighters could have been kept at bay by better ground anti-aircraft defences. I doubt if this is a reasonable solution to the problem in country where transport on the ground is so difficult. I think that anti-aircraft defence, except at very important bases, should be limited to small light weapons for immediate local protection and that the main reliance in dealing with enemy fighters should be placed on our own fighters.

In this Exercise, terrain, rather than logistics, appeared to limit the number of men that could actually engage the enemy at any one time. This may well not be generally true of Arctic and sub-Arctic operations, since in this case the supply situation was unusually good due to advance planning and stockpiling and deployment was exceptionally limited, not only by the terrain, but also by the speed of advance demanded by the plan of the Exercise and by the shortage of over-snow vehicles.

It is quite possible that in a real operation, supplies would not be so readily available and deployment would be better, so that logistic problems would limit the size of the ground forces.

Now a brief word about a few of the specific problems encountered by the Army.

Food, clothing and personal equipment, such as sleeping bags and tents, were in general, quite satisfactory, though a good many suggestions were made for minor improvements. The rations used were mainly American five in one rations, with certain supplements, and they were well liked by the troops. The only complaint that I heard was that too much tea was supplied! I suppose that this must be regarded as one of the aftermaths of World War II.

The weapons and equipment of the Army proved generally satisfactory, but the Exercise did disclose ways in which they could be improved. There was a very general feeling that the mobility of the ground forces must be increased. This could be done by providing more and better over-snow vehicles, that would be capable of operating off the roads and a very much larger proportion of bulldozers to pull sleds and to make roads for wheeled vehicles. The Canadian snowmobile, or Penguin, seemed to be the best of the over-snow vehicles for the conditions encountered during the Exercise. The Canadian Army has already begun to develop improved snowmobiles of the same type, and there is every reason to hope that they will be even more satisfactory, and that their widespread introduction will greatly increase the mobility of the Army in the North. In the more mountainous parts of the manoeuvre area, it was not too difficult to get vehicles off the road and into the bush, so that both vehicles and tents were reasonably well concealed from the air. In the flat country near Northway, where the trees were small and sparse, it was very difficult to get off the road and to find cover, and camouflage in general was poor. When fighting in this type of country, it may be necessary to provide for a change from white to green camouflage, as the occasion demands. More bulldozers are certainly needed to help wheeled vehicles off the road and into cover.

The longer radio links between units on the ground were not very satisfactory. This was not so much due to actual defects in signal equipment, as it was to the effects of screening by mountains, and the existence of unfamiliar propagation conditions. It should be possible to produce considerable improvement in communications, as a result of the experience on this Exercise, though good radio communication in this type of country will never be easy to achieve.

The experiences of the Air Force produced no new or unexpected problems. This was the first time that jet fighters had been operated in the sub-Arctic in large numbers on a Exercise of this kind. Experience confirmed the view that the jet engine is particularly suited to Arctic operation. It is simple, relatively easy to start and easily protected against the effects of cold. Even now, it is fairly easy to maintain and it is certain that future jet engines will require even less attention in the field. The overall record of 80% serviceability of all aircraft engaged in the Exercise is, in itself, sufficient testimony to the success of the air operations.

It is important to realize that the aircraft were entirely serviced in the open. No one of them was in a hangar during the period of the Exercise, with the exception of a few fighters that were serviced in a temporary hangar that had been erected at Burwash Landing as part of the Exercise. The fact that it was possible to service aircraft entirely in the open shows that conditions were not as severe as the worst that are encountered in the Arctic barrens. In parts of the Arctic where high winds are encountered, some shelter is essential to any mechanical work. Once aircraft are in the air in the Arctic, no special problems related to cold are encountered. In fact, throughout most of the Exercise, there was a very marked temperature inversion, so that the temperatures, even at a few thousand feet, were considerably higher than on the ground. This condition is not uncommon in that area, and makes for very smooth and comfortable flying.

The main problems that were encountered in the air were those of communication and navigation. The range of VHF radio at low altitudes was severely limited by the mountains. This not only limited communication, but also affected the use of certain radio aids to navigation. The difficulties of navigation in this sort of country again underline the importance of a two-seater fighter like the CF-100, which would be capable of carrying a navigator and adequate instruments to ensure not only a successful attack, but also a safe return to base. However, in spite of these difficulties, no aircraft were lost during the Exercise. All the casualties occurred during take-off or landing. The mountains also interfered with the operation of radar, both for early warning and for the ground control of interception. This limitation on the range of radar is a very serious one, and it will not easily be overcome. From the technical point of view, the solution is simple. It is merely necessary to put the radar stations on the tops of suitable mountains; from the practical point of view this is usually out of the question and some more feasible, if less satisfatcory, solution must be found.

This description of "Exercise Sweetbriar" shows that it was primarily a test of the present state of training and equipment for sub-Arctic operations. It involved little novel equipment and no new weapons, and the weather conditions were not the worst that can be found in the Arctic. However, these things are not being neglected. Many novel items of equipment are under development, or are being tested under better controlled experimental conditions in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. These will appear in use in later Exercises. Training for operations in the true Arctic is going on at Churchill.

In fact, at the very time that we visited "Exercise Sweetbriar" a much smaller, but very important Exercise, called "Sun Dog I" was in progress near Churchill. The Exercise force consisted of a Company of the Royal Canadian Regiment, with supporting detachments from the Signal, Medical and Electrical and Mechanical Engineering Corps, totalling in all, 240 men. This force was entirely self-contained and fully mobile. It lived on the edge of the barrens, south and east of Churchill, for a month. During this period, it moved across country about 250 miles, carried out carefully planned experiments with rations and equipment, and tried new tactics against an imaginary enemy. It encountered as severe weather conditions as can ordinarily be found even in the barrens. On the worst day, the temperature ranged from 25° to 32° below zero, with a gusty wind of 25 miles an hour.

The general lessons that were learned from the Exercise, can therefore be summarized thus:

(1) The clothing, food, personal equipment, individual training and leadership of Canadian and American ground-force troops is now good enough that they can fight very effectively in the sub-Arctic. Although there is room for minor improvement in all these things, there is no reason to be dissatisfied with the present state of affairs.

(2) The vehicles now available are adequate for fighting along a highway, as in this Exercise, but would be inadequate if an attempt were made to deploy rapidly across country. Any Unit moving across country on the ground will have to be fully equipped with suitable tracked over-snow vehicles. Many believe that, under such conditions, re-supply should be entirely by air.

(3) In the Arctic and sub-Arctic, the Air Force will play an important part in nearly all operations and in many it will be the dominant factor. Aircraft can operate successfully in all parts of the Arctic and sub-Arctic, though there is considerable room for improvement in navigational aids, methods of detection and control of aircraft, and in ground servicing, where windchill is high.

Probably the most important single lesson of the Exercise was the renewed demonstration of the ease with which Canadians and Americans can work together in harmony. I am sure that the very real team spirit that grew up between the forces of the two countries, could only be developed between the people of two democratic nations. We have once more demonstrated to the World that the methods of democracy make possible the amicable solution of even such difficult problems as joint military command of the Forces of two sovereign nations. It is surely not unreasonable to hope that the same sort of relationship between nations may ultimately spread throughout the World, and thus bring an end to the recurring Wars that beset mankind.

"THE PLAGUE OF PESSIMISM"

An Address By

MAJOR GLADSTONE MURRAY,
M.C., D.F.C., Croix de Guerre

Chairman: First Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, April 6th, 1950

Mr. Hermant:

It is again our great pleasure to have with us as Guest Speaker, our own Member—Major Gladstone Murray.

It would appear almost presumptuous on my part to attempt to introduce one so well known to us, so I shall content myself with quoting just one line from today's notice card, which states—"He is famous from coast to coast as a champion of private enterprise."

Major Murray:

MOSCOW ON CANADA

After one of its more virulent outbursts of hate the other night, the Moscow Radio quoted a Canadian who was recently an honoured guest of Soviet Russia. The Rev. James Endicott, a former United Church Missionary, permitted his name to be used in support of the statement that most Canadians were sunk in gloom and despair. This is the way the radio commentator summed-up: "More and more Canadians are recognising every day that the Capitalist system is in its death throes. And so the toiling masses of individual workers and farmers are turning to Communism as the only hope of rescue from complete catastrophe". On the same programme, a Soviet military expert discussed the role of Canada as the Belgium of World War III, hopefully emphasizing that we shall be ground to pieces between the two giant antagonists. This concentration on Canada has two purposes, the more important being to assist the isolationists of the United States diminish help for Western Europe, and the other purpose, of course, to spread apprehension in Canada.

MR. BUCK AND HIS CHAPLAIN

Dr. Endicott has been in Soviet Russia getting fresh instructions. His chief, Mr. Tim Buck, head of the Labor-Progressive Party, the Communist front in Canada, has been behind the Iron Curtain, where he conferred with M. Thorez, who acts for the Cominform in matters affecting North America. Both are due back shortly and we can look forward to a fresh eruption of Soviet claptrap. The public line will try to push the spurious "Peace" and "Ban the Bomb" campaign; but the really important instructions concern further frantic efforts to induce economic depression. Then, of course, there are the preparations to be completed for sabotage on the outbreak of a shooting war.

THE EFFECT OF PROPAGANDA

If one follows the Olympian utterances of the mighty new hierarchy of celebrated commentators, and newsletter moguls, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that we are being infected by the plague of pessimism which the minions of Moscow are so diligently spreading. It is one thing to be aware of the seriousness of the situation; it is quite another thing to get scared stiff. Moreover it is high time we realised this spread of pessimism in North America is a major objective of Soviet policy in the conduct of the Cold War.

THE WAR ISSUE

I propose now to try to get the elements of the problem into some kind of rational perspective. Let's start at the dark end. What is the worst conceivable fate that could befall us? the answer is not in doubt. The worst fate that could befall Canada would be absorption by the Soviet Empire. To avoid this fate we are preparing ourselves along with our allies against attack both internal and external. No one in his right mind wants war, least of all those who have had direct experience of it. Atom and Hydrogen bombs and germs certainly do not add to the attractiveness of war. But let's inject some common sense into considering what attitude will be best calculated to spare us the ordeal of another World War.

We know that the Soviet are now doing all they can to depress our morale. We should know also that if the Soviets cannot frighten us half-way to surrender or paralysis by shouting the horrors of a new war, they are much less likely to attack us with force. To get the wind-up and to try appeasement would be a direct invitation to aggression. For it should be more widely understood that there is only one thing the Soviets really respect, and that is formidable strength, economic as well as military. Our cue then is to disregard the propaganda drive,—as indeed it is largely discounted within Soviet Russia,—while we continue to make reasonable military preparations but putting the main emphasis on the consolidation and expansion of economic power.

WHEN WICKEDNESS BECOMES VIRTUE

If war comes, we shall take it in our stride, regarding it as just another incident on the road. If this is our attitude, there is the best chance of avoiding war. But to talk of placating the lads of the Kremlin is just the same as contemplating a contract with a jungle tiger. The pledged word of the Soviet gang is utterly worthless. Indeed they pride themselves on the way they violate treaties. Whether or not there is honour among thieves, there is certainly no ingredient of honour implied by the Soviets in any arrangement with the free world. Listen to this basic dictum of Soviet doctrine and practice: "Communist ethics make it the highest duty to accept the necessity of acting wickedly. This is the greatest sacrifice the revolution asks from us. The conviction of the true Communist is that evil transforms itself into good through the dialectics of historical evolution."

THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

It is important to distinguish between the Russian people and the Kremlin gang. We recall with admiration and gratitude the gallantry and endurance of the Russian armies in their titanic struggles against the invading Nazi-Germans. But we should also recall that those gallant Russians were fighting to defend the soil of Mother Russia; the Red Dictators of the Kremlin, when faced with supreme danger, abandoned their Communist mumbo-jumbo and rallied their forces by reviving the basic devotion to Mother Russia. Disorderly retreat was transformed into an avalanche of victory as though Peter the Great had returned.

The situation today is completely different. It is known as a fact that the Kremlin gang is not "getting away with" its hysterical nonsense about the threat of Western capitalism. The morale of the Russian millions is dismally low and continues to decline. To regard the Soviets as a military menace to the free world is ridiculous to the point of being fantastic.

VICTORY CERTAIN

If Moscow is rash enough to risk armed conflict, and if the West rejects the Red propaganda at least as well as the Russian people themselves are doing, the enemy will be defeated not only completely but also quickly. His vast ramshackle Empire will fall to pieces. It will fall to pieces anyway because the world both East and West has outgrown the age of Empires maintained by force and fraud to exploit and to enslave. Only it will fall to pieces sooner if the Soviets start a shooting war. The defection of Tito of Yugo Slavia is more significant than is generally realised. Tito was a mainstay of the Soviet Empire; whether he wanted to revolt or not, his people simply would not stand for the Moscow tyranny. The Tito affair is the symptom of a disease that is spreading. There are ominous rumblings from other Satellite countries. Moreover I believe that what looks today like a major reverse for the West in China may turn out quite differently. Those best qualified to judge are convinced that Chinese nationalism, which is the product of reaction against all foreign intervention, cannot be integrated with Soviet Imperialism whatever a puppet regime may attempt.

The problem of Soviet Imperialism disguised as Communism is an unpleasant obstacle but we must try to keep it in perspective. Actually it is the dying kick of outmoded history, the sole serious impediment to the application of common sense to world affairs. Whatever happens, we must take this challenge in our stride. And when the thing is done with, we shall wonder why we were so worried. But we shall be profoundly grateful we did not try to dodge it.

TOWARDS ONE WORLD

When the Soviet structure collapses, there will be another mess to clean up, whether the collapse results from cold or shooting war. No human power can save the Communist gangs from the vengeance of the millions of released slaves. Something approaching anarchy will prevail for a time over a large part of the globe. Effective international organisation on a world scale will be no longer just a favorite subject for debate and argument; it will be indispensable to the survival of the human race. Fortunately we shall still have the British Commonwealth, then as now the only enduring link between all the Continents and all the races of mankind. I believe Canada will give decisive leadership in transforming the United Nations by injecting the spirit of the British Commonwealth, thus providing the first real hope of achieving the One World ideal.

INTERNAL ATTACK

Let's consider the Soviet prospects of subduing us by internal sabotage in a prolonged Cold War. The Soviet hope relies on industrial collapse, mass unemployment, and Trade Union revolt. The best authorities, notably Professor Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard, are convinced there will be no serious industrial dislocation in the foreseeable future; the wavelike movement of industry is likely to be moderated; a rhythm of manageable dips but no depressions; and so there will be no mass unemployment. And even if this forecast is wrong: even if there is a steep depression it does not follow at all that the Communists will benefit on that account. They are more likely to be blamed. For in the Trade Unions, the situation is wholly unfavourable to the Soviets. Not enough credit has been given to the Trade Unions of Canada, the United States, the rest of the British Commonwealth, yes, and to most of the Trade Unions of the other free countries—for their determined and courageous rejection of Communism. Not only is a thorough housecleaning in progress but also a new international Trade Union organisation has been created, free of all Communist influence. And another constructive factor is the emergence of a new conception of business statesmanship. Gone are the days when Management regarded its job as finished when a reasonable profit seemed assured. Social responsibility is now accepted by the bulk of Management on this Continent and throughout the British Commonwealth. Communism is not now a direct internal danger. The Welfare State has arrived and, as long as it really is an instrument of public welfare, and not perverted into camouflaged totalitarian Big Government, the Communists and their fellow-traveller allies will burrow in vain.

THE FUTURE OF CANADA

In recent times there has been a curious reluctance to dwell upon the future possibilities of Canada. I still recall, as a youngster in British Columbia at the turn of the century, being thrilled by the orators who rhapsodized about the future of Canada. The fashion receded. Wars and their consequences helped to breed a cynicism and uncertainty that made it almost "bad form" to be confident about the future. There is need now to revive the glowing inspiration of the pioneering period. There is, however, one consideration that should be kept in mind always. Some element of risk is indispensable to progress. And this applies especially to Canada.

Without risk-taking, sometimes against tremendous odds, our fathers would have got nowhere. And we are still only at the beginning. Given a persistence of the spirit of the pioneers, Canada's future is dazzling; nowhere else in the world is there anything to compare with it. With 300,000,000 acres of arable land, barely half of which has been broken; with a million and a half square miles of forest; with an industrial production of five billions a year and just beginning, with mineral and other resources unexampled anywhere else; with a population of thirteen and a half millions (too small it is true but made up of the descendants of the best stock in the world) Canada looks forward to an era of development vastly greater than anything in the past. But always and everywhere we must be ready and willing to take risks, yes, to live dangerously. If we become timid and accept the safety-first doctrine of the Collectivists, we shall not only fail to win the total security promised to us, we also shall fail as a part of free civilisation and will have to yield to others of more vigour, determination and courage.

IDEAS ARE REALITY

Ideas are what really matter. Ideas imply some sense of values. From each man's sense of values flows his conception of life. Organisation itself, of the most elementary kind, implies the prior existence of values. Organise society on police-state values of terrorism and privileged bureaucracy and you get the ultimate misery of the masses of Soviet Russia. Organise society on Socialist values that ignore incentive and personal responsibility and you get the sharpening austerity and regimentation which the British people are now trying to discard.

TWO FALLACIES

Experience has abundantly proved that, if you base society solely on the idea of economic gains, scrapping freedom and justice for the sake of the tyranny needed to organise total planning, then you will lose not only the freedom but also the economic gains. Moreover it has been as abundantly proved that if your idea is to seek economic gains by placing the profit motive in unregulated control, the result will be equally disastrous. Karl Marx, the great prophet of Communism, and Adam Smith, the great prophet of free enterprise, both wrote a lot about what they called the "economic man". They were writing about a myth; there is no such thing in a free society as the economic man,—a sort of automaton capable of drawing total satisfaction from material environment.

IDEALISM ESSENTIAL

The truth is that the goals of materialism can be achieved only by an idealistic interpretation of life. Real economic gains can be secured only by a faith that subordinates economic gains to individual freedom. The so-called philosophy of pragmatism is unpragmatic; it just doesn't work.

IDEAS THE FIRST LINE

In the world struggle now going on ideas are far more potent than Hydrogen Bombs, Atom Bombs, or conventional armaments. True, we must not neglect our military defences but the first line is ideas. It was the Communists who first placed the weapons in this order. And until there was actual experience of how communist promises are fulfilled they had some advantage in the war of ideas. If you promise to redress everyone's grievances, and no-one knows for sure that you either cannot or do not intend to carry out your promises, it is not easy to oppose. Today, however, the situation is changed. The cynical hypocrisy of Communist promises is a by-word over half the world. And another factor works to our advantage. The desperate measures taken to close off the Communist controlled countries from all contact with the Democracies cannot succeed. There are limits to the effectiveness of secret police and thought control. Communism does intimidate, terrorize, and subjugate its victims for a time but the human spirit cannot be imprisoned for long by physical restraint. No oppression has permanence. The necessity for iron curtains, and slave labour camps, and secret police is in itself an admission of failure. Double talk is nourishing its own nemesis—for example, the hollow pretension that Communism and Socialism are revolutionary in the sense of liberating. The idea of the prudently regulated market economy is the dominating revolutionary force of the modern age. The creed of Collectivism is the ultimate in reaction, aimed at reimposing the miserable servitude of primitive society.

MATERIALISM

I have pleaded that the Soviet problem be regarded as just an incident on the road. The disappearance of this conspiracy will help to clear the road but of itself will not guarantee attainment of the glittering destiny that the future should unfold. Marxism has no monopoly of materialism; indeed it was from the shortcomings and injustices of the first stage of the industrial era that Marxism took its idea of dialectical materialism. The soul-corroding worship of Mammon has intruded deeply into Western thought and action; fortunately it is not impregnably entrenched nor is it the base of our philosophy of life. But if we yield to a consuming spirit of materialism we shall fail just as lamentably as if we had been submerged by the Communist flood. If our sole aim is material well-being, then we had better not try at all.

THE SUPREME TEST

In the new age that is opening up—the age of atomic energy revolutionising every process from medicine to agriculture—the age of exploration of the solar system in which space-ships will be as familiar as the aeroplanes of today—we must be anchored firmly to the solid rock of spiritual values. This will be the supreme test of the citizenship of Canadians.

The yearning for spiritual fulfilment is universal in human nature, although it is expressed in many forms and embodied in many creeds. The "Achilles heel", the chief weakness of Communism, is its defiant denial of even the possibility of spiritual power and Divine guidance. Nor has the spectacular material progress of the free world been attended by permeating spiritual perception. Now, however, the stage has been reached in the release and utilisation of the powers of nature when we can no longer afford to ignore the malignant disease of materialism. Nothing short of widespread spiritual awakening can qualify us for citizenship in the era ahead. This transcends everything else. And the awakening should not be delayed. This is no matter of creed or cult. Spiritual power flows automatically from the practice by the individual of the elementary Christian virtues,—the Golden Rule, humility, kindness, charity, tolerance, and submission in prayer. And, as awareness spreads, spiritual radiation transforms the family, the group, the community, and the nation. Without spiritual orientation Democracy itself is drab and futile. The urge is latent in all free citizens; that it should become universally active will provide the only valid guarantee that ours will be the first civilisation in the whole of history to avoid decay in maturity.

If the instinct of Canadians does not teach this compellingly, everything else it has taught will have been in vain. But I do not admit even the possibility of failure. To resist the pessimists in the region that impinges on eternity is much easier than to deflate the calamity-howlers that have swallowed the puerile gibberish of Moscow. For the decisions that govern the fate of civilisations and of nations do not rest entirely or even mainly with frail humanity if it but grope towards eternal truth.

"SPORTSMEN, INDEED?"

An Address By

GREGORY CLARK

Famous Humourist

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, April 13th., 1950

Mr. Colebrook:

The title of our distinguished guest's address today suggests that we may be going to hear something about some of the poor little fish that should have been thrown back or about the great big ones that went back under their own steam.

Anyway, it is a great pleasure to have the inimitable Gregg with us.

His background is distinctly colorful—Born into the Journalistic World—his father having been Editor of the Toronto Star for many years—he has pursued that profession right through. After attending Harbord Collegiate and the University of Toronto, he joined the Toronto Star in 1911 and remained with them until 1945. During these years however, he served with distinction in two World Wars.

In the first as a Major from 1916-18, being awarded the M.C. In the second from 1939 to 1945 as an accredited War Correspondent in Italy, Normandy and elsewhere, having seen also the Great Retreat in France in 1940.

In addition to his humorous writings so well known—in 1936 he began feature writings such as the Royal Coronation—the Papal Coronation etc.

In 1945, we find him taking up Radio Commentating—later associating himself with the Montreal Standard and as a columinist with "The Packsack" a feature appearing daily in several leading newspapers across Canada.

Author—

Inventor of Trout Fly patterns—

Contributor to conservation ideas on wild life and fishing—He himself has fished in Canada, America, Europe and Africa.

NOTE: In addition to his accomplishments as a writer, humourist and orator, Greg Clark is a talented actor. So much so that his gestures and facial contortions during the telling of his stories created gales of laughter making it impossible for our stenographer to get a true word for word transcription. That is the reason this is presented in the form of a report.

Mr. Clark said he could bring us a message but largely as the result of that experience referred to in the very kind introduction, he has lost faith in messages, having listened to them and transmitted them for the last thirty-five years. Privately, he doesn't think anybody knows what they are doing and if we do, he would rather not know what it is.

In honour of the fact that this is Wild Life Week throughout Canada, and in view of the fact that the Trout Season opens in two weeks and a couple of days, he thought he might interrupt the tenor of our normal paths with a discussion on a subject that he has given a great deal of attention to since an experience when, as a young man, he went with his father on one of many fishing trips, and he said, "A sportsman is one who not only will not show his own father where the best fishing holes are but will deliberately direct him to the wrong ones."

This is what you might call a parental warning from a life-long study of a sportsman. It seems to him that the sportsman comes nearest to the natural man.

His first story had to do with the thing that comes immediately to mind when he hears an angler and that is Veracity. Some years ago, with his late partner, Jim Frise, they went for what was then the closing of the season of muskies, to the Kawartha Lakes on the 14th of October. It is now the first, but the 14th was a sort of holy day in the Angler's calendar. Arriving at Burleigh Falls they found only one other angler there, an old friend from Wellington, W. Va., a small, frail, elderly gentleman, silver gray, with about $2,000. worth of fishing tackle with him. He was a very gifted and brilliant muskie fisher.

At that season of the year the muskies have gone into the hard shores, because the vegetation is decaying and the water around the beds is filled with stinking weeds, so the muskies go on the hard shores and there you fish casting to the shore. And there the muskies are found, great fish in 2 or 3 feet of water, and when they take your bait they can't go down, they must come up, and you are guaranteed a magnificent sport.

The three proceeded down to Stony Lake, because that October day there was a fitful Eastern wind not too good for fishing and the shores were like a paisley shawl for colour. It was a mystical day. His friend was first, Jim Frise next and Greg came last. Important to the story is the fact that the American was a quiet and very reserved gentleman, while Jim having been associated with Greg for twenty-five years had not had much opportunity of developing the art of conversation. The American's guide was an Ojibway, and Jimmie's guide was Buster Brown, an Ojibway, but his guide was Scotty Hogarth, who had been born in Scotland, married an Ojibway, and lived on the Reservation. Scotty and he were vocal anglers.

With Scotty Hogarth at the paddle, Greg could not help but exclaim on the beauties of nature, the mystical qualities of the day, and could not refrain from remarking on the skillful paddling of Mr. Hogarth, who, in turn, could not resist saying, without doubt Greg was the finest caster he had ever seen.

A half or three-quarters of an hour after starting Greg was delighted to land, most vociferously, a muskie of about 11 pounds. The other two had not so much as a rise, not even from a bass.

Greg came up with his third, and most magnificently landed a 14-pound muskie. He was through for the day.

They proceeded to the shore and had lunch. The guides had the large muskie, the gentlemen the smaller ones. Greg told all concerned he now, having had his limit of muskies, any other fish which he caught would be brought to the attention of the nearest warden, and with that clear in his conscience, they proceeded.

The day grew more fitful, the day grew more beautiful, the day remained unpropitious. But the American continued, with all his skill, Mr. Frise with all his skill, and they never got so much as a rise from a bass.

But at 2.30 Greg landed an eight-pounder, and asked, "Does anybody want a muskie?" At three o'clock he hooked and landed one of 15 pounds. By this time, he assures us, Mr. Scotty Hogarth and he were a pain in the neck to the others.

Important to the story is this fact: that Greg was wearing a rust red Harris Tweed Jacket and Plus 4's, and a black pullover sweater which his wife had knitted, a sleeveless black pullover sweater underneath the rust red outer garment, that was rather a memorable combination—rust red and black.

Now Greg had grown a little warm with taking all these fish and all this conversation, and he had taken off his jacket, pulled the sweater over his head, and put it over the array of comestibles. At that moment both his associates were busy—neither of them saw him remove his jacket.

The very next cast he made he hooked some wild celery—reeled off, and as he reached in the water to remove the celery he saw a monster coming—it was a fish of at least 18 pounds. He threw himself back, the muskie took the block, struck him on the chest, left a trail of slime, went over his shoulder and fastened in the sweater, and when his two friends looked back they beheld the muskie in the air over Greg's head, waving his sweater. The poor fish looked like a Spanish bull and could not see what was doing. They removed the sweater and the hook, held it up to his friends, this magnificent fish. Greg saw they had ceased fishing and the two were proceeding with their guides toward him. Scotty said, "They think it took your sweater off."

As they drew near, Scotty and Greg were busy exclaiming upon all the wonders they had ever seen in their angling experience, there had never been one like this. The friends landed alongside and looked at him in astonishment. Scotty handed over the sweater, there was not a tear in it, just a few loose threads.

Their American friend said, "How did he do it?" Greg said, "I saw him coming, he reached down, and click (Showing how the sweater went up in the air with the fish) and that is all I know."

Jimmie said, "But it is impossible." And Greg looked at him in some astonishment.

They went ashore, Greg taking the sweater and continuing to wring it out. His companions stood at one edge of the shore. It was a mystical day, the sky gray, fitful, it was getting towards an October evening. They looked at each other, then looking at Greg, the American came up and said, "Look Greg, it is completely and totally impossible that that fish could have pulled that sweater off without removing your jacket." Greg said, "My friend, it is the last day of the muskies, we have had a beautiful day, at least I have. Now don't let's get involved in anything. Let's say it didn't happen."

The American looked at him almost reverently and said, "But, My God, I saw it."

Scotty and Greg returned to the canoe and went back to the hotel, and up to his room where he had some other form of comestibles.

There were some other Americans staying at the hotel, and their gales of laughter could be heard mixed with the angry, strident voices of Greg's companions. Then they all came upstairs, and one of them said, "I'm Turley from Cleveland, and I have an affidavit here, these men witnessed a muskie pull your sweater off without removing your jacket. All you have to do is get a Canadian attorney to make this legal."

Pocketing the affidavit, Greg then came clean.

He tells this story for the reason that when you doubt the veracity of an angling gentleman, give him the benefit of the doubt. When he says he saw a fish this long and this deep, whenever he indulges in any of the familiar, what appears to be excesses of "angling talk," remember that like his friends and their guides, they were victims of an optical illusion.

His second story was not so pleasant, reflecting less pleasantly upon the character of anglers. If any McMillan's were in the gathering, Greg begged them to realize that name was given this man in order to disguise his real identity.

He was an insurance man, a man considerably older than Greg, but never in all his experience of men had Greg held a man in greater contempt. He was a reprehensible character in every sense of the word, one of the most contemptible men, as you will shortly agree.

They had a little party, which Jimmie Frise was in. They went to the Kawarthas and rented a cottage. Staying three or four or five days, and agreeing that they would take the gross weight of fish each day—the man with the greatest gross weight of fish free; the man with the least weight of fish paying the full expense of the day, including rent of the cottage, etc. They divided up, and each morning they fished alone, because as Lord Byron has said, "Angling is the solitary sport."

Never once in seven or eight years had that man McMillan paid. Why? Because he was an expert bait caster and he was even known to bait a trolling line. He would take for gross weight of fish, not only muskies, large and small, but also rock bass, sun fish, dog fish, and a conglomeration of others he would put in his basket, and submit them, fighting as only lawyers and insurance men can.

Now on this day this man was around behind the Sugar Loaf Island, when an Indian came in a canoe, ceased paddling, and floating by, said, "Do you want to see a fish?" McMillan said, "Yes." The Indian came alongside and in the bottom of that canoe was the most beautiful jade green muskie fish, a beautiful, massive muskie.

McMillan said, "What are you going to do with it?" He said, "I don't know."

"Would you sell it?"

"Yes."

"How much do you want?"

"$1."

McMillan said, "I'll take it."

When the Indian started to put it in the boat, McMillan said, "Leave it where it is." He reached in his wallet and took a dollar out, which he gave to the Indian. Then he took out a card and folding it lengthwise twice, he asked the Indian to open the jaws of this beautiful fish, and down in the soft gullet of that fish he pressed this piece of paper until only ½″ of it projected.

Then he said to the Indian, "Now, on the other side of the Island, you will see a queer character fishing, and I want you to go alongside him, and if he wants to buy it, sell it."

There was Greg on the other side of that Island, fishing, filled with zeal. He had made no secret that he was going to beat McMillan: this time he was going to pay, and Greg fished carefully, with stealth, cunning. And he had one little miserable pound-an-a-half bass, when around the Island came the Indian. He paddled up nearby, let his canoe drift, and he said, "Want to see a fish?" Greg said, "Sure."

He came alongside and in the bottom of that canoe was this most beautiful jade green muskie. He saw this masterpiece and looked carefully around the horizon in all directions. He studied the stumps and trees and bushes of Sugar Loaf Island. Greg said to the Indian, "What are you going to do with it? Would you sell it?" He said, "Yes." Then, "How much?" He asked, "$2." Greg said, "Slip it here."

Greg then was faced with a problem only the clergy will understand. He said, "Now, if for the rest of this day I have luck, if fortune smiles upon me for the remainder of this day, I will not use that fish, but if I don't have any luck, I am afraid—" In other words, he passed the buck. But don't think he did not fish with the greatest devotion for the balance of that afternoon. He fished as hard as he had ever fished in his life, and not one other fish did he get, only that measly little bass.

Adopting the air of the conquering hero he took the prize back to shore, and all his friends were at the dock to meet him, and he was more than surprised at the warmth of the reception they gave him. They assisted him in carrying it up. And they weighed it. They continued their praise and expressions of admiration. He told them every detail of its catch. Told a dramatic, beautiful story of the capture of this masterpiece.

Taking the lantern to peer at the fish, they exclaimed, "Look at these jaws! Look at the teeth!" They opened its mouth. McMillan looked in and he said, "What is this?" Greg got down and looked, risking his hand he put it in that dreadful maw. He took hold of that little white object, he took hold of it. McMillan insured it.

That is the kind of *stinker* you will find amongst Sportsmen.

His next story is an anticlimax, but it refers to a man known to all of us for so many years. He couldn't refrain from telling it.

It is about Sir William Mulock, Ontario's grand old man, the Chief Justice, who lived to 92, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, or one of those years. Resolutely he went trout fishing up to his private pound in Markdale.

The paper with which Greg was then associated, they made him the demi-bottle of the grand old man, and every time he went fishing in the Open season Greg had to go along as an amanuensis, and he went along with Sir William and gave them, every first of May, a familiar story of the grand old man opening the trout season. And he tells us privately that all those trout you saw heaped up, he saw them all.

On this day they were driving up. Sir William, as you may recall, was a nimble man on the dollar, and they had his Cadillac, and behind it was a home-made trailer, loaded with everything a gentleman would require.

As they came near Dundalk the road was filled with the most colossal pitch-holes you ever saw. Holden was driving, the housekeeper up in front, Sir William in his sports jacket. They proceeded until they hit this pitch-hole, when there was a loud crack, and the home-made trailer, with all its contents, climbed the stump fence.

Greg started to bail out, but he said, "Oh, no, Clark, stay where you are--Holden will attend to it."

In due time Holden brought them the glad tidings that nothing was broken, miraculous as it may seem.

Meanwhile traffic was stalled, but when anybody got off to see what happened and saw the reverend countenance of our Chief Justice they went back to their car and waited.

They got a little sorry for the poor fellow stuck immediately in front of them, because he had stalled his engine and done that fateful thing, lifted the hood, and he was perspiring profusely.

Sir William called to Holden to put a stick at the door of the car, and come down. He did, and was asked, "How was it coming?" he said, "I have sent for the farmer."

"You might bring Mr. Clark and me each a bottle of beer," said Sir William. He said, "Very good, Sir William." And he came down and got a bottle each for the Chief Justice and his demi-bottle.

Sir William took the bottle, and Greg kept pace with his great old friend; as he got down that far, Greg got down that far, too. After they got down about that far, Sir William said, "Holden, you might get another bottle of beer and give it to this poor chap here who is having trouble with his car." And Holden, scrunched down on the floor of the car, said, "Sir William, you can't drink beer on the public highway."

"Hide it! Hide it! Damn the laws, they change them every twenty-five years." And believe it or not, they proceeded the 17 miles to Markdale, with the Chief

Justice of Ontario and his amanuensis, each with their index finger stuck down a partly consumed bottle of beer.

In closing, Greg said, "As I said a moment ago, the Sportsman appears to me to be nearest to the natural man. Philosophy since time began has concerned itself with good and evil. I don't think the natural man is either good or evil: I think he is just a little bad.

"DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FUNCTIONS AND OBJECTIVES"

AN ADDRESS BY

HONOURABLE WILLIAM GRIESINGER,
M.C., V.D.

MINISTER OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, April 20th, 1950

MR. COLEBROOK:

Honourary Guests—Members and Friends—

The subject of our Minister's address as announced, must be one of great interest to all loyal citizens who take pride in the development and beautification of their country and particularly their own province.

Colonel Griesinger was elected to the Ontario Legislature in 1945, as Minister without Portfolio, following a long record of military service, having been awarded the Military Cross in World War I—in which he served first with the 19th B'n., C.E.F.—promoted to Lieutenant in 1915—Captain in 1916 and Major in 1917.

He then served in the Canadian Militia as Lt.-Col., with the Essex Scottish from 1933-36 and later with the Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury Regt., 1941-1944.

In 1949 he was appointed Minister of Planning and Development for the Ontario Government.

MR. GRIESINGER:

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen:

First, may I express to your President my appreciation for his very kind introduction. Probably he has overdone it a bit.

Secondly, may I say I do appreciate the opportunity of being your Guest Speaker today and I trust I may have something of interest to you all.

Before my appointment as Minister of Planning and Development in 1949, I was Chief Commissioner of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario and as such maybe I might have found something more tasty about which to talk. However, you people are the taxpayers of this Province, whether you realize this or not, and I imagine you all do. I have often felt that our people seldom know exactly how their money is being spent and for what purposes it is being used.

The Department of Planning and Development was organized in 1945 and at that time the Minister was an ex-president of yours, the Honourable Dana Porter, and I believe Professor Langford, who is present with us today at the Head Table, was the first official appointed to the Department. Since that time it has grown to a great extent and I can truthfully say its ramifications are manifold. To give you some idea, the Department of Planning and Development has under its jurisdiction Community Planning, Conservation, Immigration, Trade and Industry, Ontario House, London, England, Ontario Research Council, the Ontario Northland Railway, which is your Railway, and Housing, which presents quite a problem today. If Rental Control had not been satisfactorily taken care of in Ottawa a few months ago, unfortunately we would have had this under our wing too. So you will see it is a very interesting and unusual Department of the Government, and, as I said before, its ramifications are manifold. Only just this morning, for instance, I was sitting in on three different conferences on three entirely different matters.

I could devote at least a half-hour and possibly a great deal longer to the activities of each Branch. Today I thought I would give you a few of the facts and figures on what this Department has accomplished.

Each Branch is headed by a Director, and I see one of our Directors here today, Mr. A. H. Richardson, who is the Director and Chief Engineer of our Conservation

Branch. Much credit must be given to Mr. Richardson for the splendid work that has been and is being carried on in conservation.

Just a few short weeks ago during the Legislative Session there was a Select Committee appointed on Conservation and that report was brought in as the Session was closing. I must say I can see the handwriting of the work of the Director of Conservation in that particular report.

The Conservation Branch is concerned with the work of conservation being done by Conservation Authorities. These are groups of municipalities which are brought together as a body corporate on the basis of watersheds, and are formed under the Conservation Authorities Act, 1946. This type of organization is a new concept in conservation, as it places the responsibility of initiating and carrying out all types of work such as land use improvement, flood control forestry, wildlife and recreation etc., in the hands of the municipalities concerned. The Branch of this Department services these Authorities by preparing a conservation plan for the whole area which indicates the types of conservation work which are most urgent. The work itself is carried out by the Authority either on its own or in conjunction with Departments of the Governments. The work may be assisted financially by grants from the Government or other sources.

At the preesnt time 13 Authorities are in being covering a total area of 10,000 square miles—and that is a lot of land, and 273 member municipalities.

The policy of the Government at the present time on Conservation is, if the type of work meets with approval of this Department we will guarantee 37½% of the cost, the Dominion Government 37½% and the participating municipalities 25%. It is true we are not in a position at the present time to carry on some of the work we would like to and I agree with the Dominion authorities that, in many cases the timing of this type of work may not be proper. It is felt we should go ahead with some work but, on the other hand, some should be held back until it is known whether or not we are heading for a recession. Let us hope this does not happen. Under this Department we have a number of "canned" plans where the engineering work has been completed and we can go ahead with it should the necessity arise. So, you can see we are prepared to work with the Dominion Government should a serious situation confront us on a moment's notice.

The Community Planning Branch administers the Planning Act which was first passed in the year 1946, and since that time 65 planning areas have been established covering more than 161 communities and municipalities, and embraces two-thirds of the population of this Province at the present time. I consider much credit must be given to the Directors and former Ministers when one realizes the growth that has taken place in the few short years that the Planning Act has been in effect.

There are also 37 Planning Boards—you have one in Toronto and North York, there is one in Windsor, and practically all the large centres today are working on plans for their future development, which I feel is becoming more and more necessary as, we find many municipalities where industry and housing are jumbled together.

I have no intention of discussing whether amalgamation or annexation is the answer to your problem here, but something must take place in a very short time in the way of orderly planning as the City of Toronto is destined to become a much larger city, and I hope that the citizens of Toronto and its outlying municipalities will be able to settle their difficulties and together work out some suitable solution to their problem.

We have also subdivisions coming under our control throughout the whole Province. These subdivisions must be properly laid out in order to provide proper housing space, sufficient space for orderly parking, sewage, water, etc. Up to the present time we have approved over 3,000 subdivision plans. In addition we have land for housing projects in 81 different municipalities, that is orderly planning for housing projects. If this work is continued, which we intend to do, the Province will have formed Planning Boards throughout its breadth and length.

Then we have our Immigration Department, although the immigration plans of our Department have been cut down materially since 1948, and particularly during 1949. You probably will recall the splendid work that Department carried out under the Honourable Dana Porter as Minister, when we inaugurated the Air Scheme from Britain to Canada. During the period that was in operation 10,000 people were transported by air to this Province, and I am glad to say practically everyone had jobs available the moment they arrived.

Today we are co-operating with the Dominion Government in their Immigration Plan and I understand a new Immigration Act will be passed in 1951. We have given them assurance that we will maintain a certain amount of immigration in the Province of Ontario, and also keep Ontario House in London, England, to cooperate with them. In fact, I might say a few short months ago we received a request for 500 farm labourers. We have had over 1,000 applications in our Ontario House in London, and up to the present time have accepted some 300. We are quite choosey whom we bring in to the Province of Ontario—we are not into immigration to bring in anyone who wishes to come—we are picking and choosing. Industry gets in touch with us, telling us what they would like and we do the rest of the work in London, England, to see they are brought in.

Housing, this is a very touchy subject, but, I do feel your Government handled the situation very well during the past several years.

The first Housing Act was brought into force in 1948. We did not feel at that time that we should go into house building proper, and I am frank in saying I do not think we should at the present time. It is not our intention to try and interfere with private enterprise. If private enterprise cannot find itself in a position to build sufficient houses, and certain communities are in such a position that they require them, then, under our new Legislation, which is complementary to the recent amendments to the National Housing Act in which we become a 25% partner with the Dominion Government, we will go into such projects, and I might say approximately 15 applications have come in from different municipalities. As fast as we can cover the territory our men are going out with the National Housing people to find out what the true picture is, and if houses are necessary they will be built.

During the past the Second Mortgage Loan Plan was in effect, and mind you it was second mortgage loans. I do not know how many of you people feel about second mrtgages, but this plan created over 15,000 houses in the Province of Ontario which are owned by the people who built them. These people who build their own homes and have a stake in them make the best citizens for any community, and it is our desire to stimulate home ownership.

At the end of December 31st, 1949, we ceased to be in the Second Mortgage field and since that time this has been taken over by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. In other words, their original first mortgage was increased to the extent to take care of the Provincial Government second mortgage. Under the Provincial Second Mortgage Plan applications to the extent of 16,726 were received, and the average second mortgage loan on these houses approximated $1,100. At the close of business second mortgages amounted to a little over $16,000,000, in fact $17,500,000.

In addition to housing loans, the Act also permitted assistance to municipalities in the way of services. Many of these homes, of course, had to be built on property not serviced by sewers, water, streets and sidewalks and direct grants were made up to a maximum of $300. per house. That was something the Province gave without any strings attached, and amounted to $1½ million dollars to the end of 1949.

Under the new Housing Legislation we become a partner of the Dominion Government, and they will do the building through their organization thereby removing the necessity of the Provincial Government establishing an overlapping organization. This new legislation permits Federal and Provincial authorities joining in projects for the acquisition and development of land for housing purposes and the construction of houses for sale or for rent under arrangements by which costs, profits and losses will be shared seventy-five per cent Federally and twenty-five percent Provincially. Provision is also made to permit municipalities to contribute to the Provincial share of the cost and to participate in implementing such joint projects. We appreciate, of course, that many of the municipalities are not financially able to enter into these but at the same time we are investigating that possibility and hope to work things out. That gives the general picture of the Housing situation.

Now, one of the most important Departments, and one in which I take a great deal of interest because I am in private enterprise myself, the lumber business, is our Trade and Industry Branch under Colonel F. J. Lyle, and when I give you a few of the figures I have here with me I think you will appreciate the work they are doing in the Province of Ontario.

During 1949, 47 new plants were established in this Province through the efforts of our Trade and Industry Branch. All kinds of manufacturing too numerous to mention—rubber goods, watches, diesel engines, automobiles, etc., and these plants have not all been established in the City of Toronto. We do not want anyone here to go away with the idea that we did not want to locate in Toronto, but we do try to have these plants more or less decentralize themselves, if possible. We would like to see them go into smaller communities, yet, I must admit we are not in a position to dictate where any plant will locate. We simply give them the information, take them around and show them properties that are available, tell them about the different municipalities, and today practically every municipality has become industrial minded. We have files that will give you every information you wish to know about any community, no matter what the size may be. Every community today has some person in their Council who is taking the responsibility for industrial development, and we have worked up an organization, I think, second to none on this Continent.

The Capital invested totals $33,000,000. giving employment to 5,300 people, with an annual payroll of $10,500,000.

Mind you that was the accomplishment of the Trade and Industry Branch in 1949, and we are hopeful the year 1950 will be just as productive.

Ontario House in London, England, has its own Trade and Industry Branch, which works under our Department, and since they have been in the Trade and Industry business have brought 20 British subsidiary or branch plants to this Province. We appreciate that since the devaluation of the pound we are experiencing more difficulty in bringing British Industry into this Province because the British Government will not allow sufficient money to be taken out under devaluation to take care of the work necessary, but we are working on plans, whether we will ever bring them to a final conclusion or not is hard to predict.

Of the 47 plants that started in Ontario last year 12 of them did located in the City of Toronto, or its immediate vicinity, and 35 elsewhere. When you take this into consideration that practically means a community the size of Niagara Falls, 21,000 people, which probably accounts for the fact our population in Ontario is growing so rapidly. Since its inception in 1945, 116 new plants have been started in the Province, which I feel is no mean effort on their behalf, and I certainly want to give them the necessary credit to which they are entitled. We hope 1950 will be as successful as the previous years.

I might mention that Ontario House has been producing very good results for the Province of Ontario. In 1943 it was re-opened—Colonel Drew was then Prime Minister of this Province. I was over in England last September and I can assure you that the public relations these people are doing in Great Britain and the United

Kingdom is something we should all be proud of. Unfortunately, they were instructed to cut their budget. I believe in 1949 their budget was around $300,000 but before I left England we had it cut down to $150,000. I, however, believe they will function just as well inasmuch as we eliminated a lot of expense in immigration. But, for $150,000 we have something of which to be proud because they have developed the 20 plants for us, and, on top of that, they built up a good relationship between our own people and the people of Great Britain, and if you ever take a trip over there, may I ask that you take advantage of Ontario House. I can assure you they will give you all the information you ask for.

Now there is one thing on which I had a lengthy conference this morning and I should like at some time to talk to you for an hour or so *on your* own Railway, The Ontario Northland Railway. It is a short line of some 450 miles with a total trackage of 700 miles. Since 1945 we have been building up this railway and at no expense to the taxpayer. Yes, it is paying its own way, and I think will continue to do so provided we use every method of economy. We are now starting to dieselize. Your revenue today, based on costs are such that you must use other methods than steam and I think that probably within a period of five to seven years this railway will be completely dieselized. That in itself is one major step we are taking. We have a Commission to operate this railway and may I say they are doing a splendid job for the taxpayers of this Province.

Last, but not least, Ladies and Gentlemen, we also have the Research Council of Ontario under our wing. I am not in a position to discuss this very freely as I have not been in the Department quite long enough to become too familiar with the work they are doing. However, I do know that 1900 small industries last year used the facilities of that organization for research work. We have a lab which is very modern in every way and small industries are allowed to come in with their problems. They in turn will investigate it and in many instances have produced something to assist the industry. I attended a meeting of the Research Council in Niagara Falls last Fall and was quite impressed with some of the things they have accomplished and some of the items they were responsible for inventing.

I recall reading a book in connection with the Research Council of the State of Texas where they organized within themselves, patented the very ideas on which they worked and sold the patents, receiving royalties from industry thereon, and finally became self-sustaining. Today this does not cost the taxpayers of that State a five cent piece. I have hopes in years to come this organization will develop the same way and not only be of some assistance to industry at large but also will be a revenue producer for the Province of Ontario.

In conclusion may I say that a lot of talk is taking place about Dominion-Provincial relations. I feel this, Gentlemen, that the prosperity of this Province, which is the most prosperous in the Dominion of Canada, depends upon its people realizing that we alone cannot prosper unless this great Dominion prospers. I can assure you, and I believe our Prime Minister, the Honourable Leslie M. Frost, has stated more than once that we will co-operate in every way with the Dominion Government. Of course, we are not going to sell the Province out, but you can see from the remarks I have made where this Department is tied in to certain Departments of the Dominion Government and unless we co-operate with the Federal Government, and with all Governments of this Dominion, then I cannot see where we will have any prosperity ourselves. I think our whole economy is tied in on the basis that we are Canadians not people who are born or living in Ontario, but we are good Canadians and the welfare of our whole country is something we want to see accomplished. I am confident when the next Dominion-Provincial Conference takes place you will see a great measure of co-operation from good old Ontario.

ANNUAL MEETING

Chairman: The President, Mr. H. G. Colebrook

Thursday, April 27th, 1950

MR. COLEBROOK:

As this is the Annual Meeting of the Club and we have a very distinguished Guest Speaker in the person of our own member and Past President—The Hon. George Drew, I shall make my report on the year's activities very brief.

Unlike the past two years, I regret to have to report that we have no surplus from the year's operations—however neither do we have a deficit. Full details of revenue and expenses will, of course, be published in the Year Book.

During the year, we have held 28 regular meetings and two combined meetings with the Canadian Club. The average attendance shows an improvement over last year—but is far from satisfactory, considering the excellence and importance of some of our speakers—this matter of attendance should be one of special concern for the incoming officers for the next season. During the year we have enrolled 120 new members, but unfortunately, by death, resignation and those dropped, we have lost 140, so that we finish with a total of 1344, which is a decrease of 20.

It is proper that I should make reference at this time to the sad passing of our old friend and Hon. Secretary—Colonel Bennett.—He had served the Club faithfully and well for some years and his sudden death was a great loss to the Club.

In his place we have fortunately secured the services of Ernest Miles, who has taken up his duties enthusiastically and efficiently.

I must now pay special tribute to one or two constant and never failing workers for the interests of the Club—

Horace Harpham—that indefatigable organizer of the Head Table.

Harry Bourlier—who is always on hand at the right moment to preside at the piano.

Walter Comber—our Hon. Treasurer, whose accounts are always in good shape for the examination of the Officers.

Mr. H. T. Jamieson—our Hon. Auditor.

Ford Ralph and *Col. Arnoldi*—our Receptionists and—*John Griffin* on the Year Book.

To all members of the Executive and Committee Chairman, I feel we owe a special debt of thanks for their faithful work.

I will now call on Mr. R. A. Stappels—Chairman of the Nominating Committee to read his report—

MR. STAPPELS:

Your Nominating Committee reports as follows:

For President: Sydney Hermant
1st Vice-President: Warren B. Hastings
2nd Vice-President: R. Ford Ralph
3rd Vice-President: Brigadier Colin A. Campbell, D.S.O., O.B.E.
Secretary: Ernest Miles
Hon. Treasurer: W. W. Comber, C.A.
Hon. Auditor: H. T. Jamieson, F.C.A.

Members of the Executive Committee:

Col. F. F. Arnoldi, D.S.O.
H. C. Bourlier
R. N. Bryson
Dr. Clarence Crummey
S. S. Fletcher
D. H. Gibson
John W. Griffin
Horace Harpham
George Hardy
Lieut-Col. N. D. Hogg, M.B.E.
Arthur E. M. Inwood

H. R. Jackman
James H. Joyce
Norman A. Keys, K.C.
G. A. Lascelles
David G. C. Menzel
John Wm. Perry

Immediate Past President: H. G. Colebrook

Past Presidents:	Thomas H. Howse Tracey E. Lloyd J. P. Pratt, K.C.

I am going to ask Dr. Herbert Bruce to second the moving of this report.

Dr. Bruce: I second the report of the Nominating Committee.

You have heard the report of the Nominating Committee, which has been moved by Mr. Stappels and seconded by Dr. Bruce.

Are there any further nominations?

There being no further nominations—I declare the nominations closed and those whose names you have heard read to be duly elected by acclamation.

It is now my pleasure to present to you your President Elect—*Mr. Sydney Hermant.* As first Vice-President—member of the Executive and of the Speakers Committee, he has taken a great interest in the affairs of the Club. You have recently had evidence of how satisfactorily he conducts the weekly meetings and I am sure that he will ably maintain the traditions of the Empire Club.—The one thing that can make his year of office the best yet—is a much larger attendance of our members every week.

Mr. Hermant:

May I just take this opportunity of thanking the Members of the Club for the honour that they have done me. I shall do my best to merit this confidence, and to serve the Club and uphold those principles for which it stands and in which I sincerely believe-"Canada and a United Empire". It is a particular honour to succeed our distinguished President and those who have preceded him in this high office. May I express my appreciation also for the very strong Executive Committee which, as always, will do the real work and provide the necessary experience.

"FREEDOM'S CROWNING HOUR"

AN ADDRESS BY

HON. GEORGE A. DREW, K.C., LL.D., M.P.

MR. COLEBROOK:

It is a very great pleasure to have with us on this, the occasion of our 47th Annual Meeting, one of our own members—a past President of the Empire Club—and a distinguished and honored citizen of one of the vital links in the Chain of Empire.

The Hon. George Drew is so well known from one end of the country to the other, that it would be presumptuous on my part to occupy time in formally introducing him to his fellow members, so I shall at once assure him of our keen anticipation and interest in his subject—"FREEDOMS CROWNING HOUR"—

Gentlemen—I present to you— The National Leader of the Progressive-Conservative Party—THE HON. GEO. DREW, K.C., L.L.D., M.P.

MR. DREW:

Mr. President and Fellow Members of the Empire Club of Canada, this is for me a particularly pleasant occasion. Amongst the happiest recollections of the many years I lived in Toronto was my intimate association with the Officers and Members of this Club. It is a great privilege for me to be with you when once again you choose your Officers for another year to guide the activities of this extremely important forum for the discussion of matters of public concern.

Because it is in the nature of a reunion for me personally, I would have preferred to choose some pleasant subject associated with this season of the year, when once again nature explodes in all its beauty to remind us so vividly that it is the law of nature itself that brightness and pleasant days do return after a period of patient waiting. Events today are such, however, that it would not be in keeping with the honour you have done me if I did not address my remarks to considerations which will affect the lives of every one of us for many years to come.

This is an important anniversary. Five years ago this week, at San Francisco, the historic meeting began, from which emerged the Charter of the United Nations. Remembering the tragic failure of the League of Nations to preserve that peace for which so many millions of men and women throughout the world had died between 1914 and 1918, there was a clearly stated determination not only to support but to enforce the principles laid down in this new Charter of hope.

Less than five years have passed since the end of the most terrible and destructive war in the long story of mankind and yet it was only last Saturday that the President of the United States made a speech which left no doubt about the nature and extent of the threat we face. He called for a campaign of truth throughout the world, to meet the lies and provocations which come from Moscow. He defined the issue in these simple words, "The cause of freedom is being challenged throughout the world today by the forces of Imperialistic Communism. There is a struggle, above all else, for the minds of men."

There is no longer room for doubt in the mind of anyone, that the cause of freedom is being challenged throughout the world by the forces of Imperialistic Communism. One ominous incident has crowded upon another with startling rapidity in these past few weeks. An unarmed United States plane was shot down over the Baltic by the Soviet Air Force. Only last week a demand was made upon Turkey that Russia have access to the Dardanelles, thus reviving an ancient claim which brought on an earlier war. Last week Russia demanded the withdrawal of the British and United States troops from Trieste on grounds which simply did not exist. Under instructions from the Kremlin, Czechoslovakia is conducting trials of the Moscow type based upon claims of spying and underground activities sponsored by the United States and Great Britain. Pressure has been increased in Indo China and in Indonesia, with new riots and disturbances almost every day. Russia has intensified demands that the Chinese Communist Government be seated in the United Nations Security Council. Last, and most critical, it has been announced that on May 28th, Germans in the Eastern half of Berlin will march under Communist direction to the Sportspalast in Western Berlin.

Any one of these events might provide the spark for an internaitonal conflagration. Except for the hysterical voice of Hitler carried to us like a warning siren over the radio, there is a blood curdling similarity between what is happening now and what happened immediately before the last world war.

Having said that I wish to emphasize my own firm conviction that peace can be preserved and some measure of international sanity restored if all those nations which have the priceless boon of freedom will remember the simple but dreadful lessons we learned in 1939 and will act in accordance with those lessons in the months and years ahead.

The immediate threat of the Atomic Bomb and the impending threat of the Hydrogen Bomb have tended to create an impression that the individual has little part to play in the cold war which in so many parts of the world has already become a shooting war. I think there may be some danger of over-emphasizing the threat of these terrible weapons. Of their ghastly destructive power there can be no doubt. There may however be some doubt as to the extent to which they could be employed.

We all remember so well how everyone within the actual impact range of war, carried their gas masks and had them beside them day and night in 1939 and for several years afterwards. Although both sides had the deadliest type of lethal gas available neither side used it, first, because of its tactical implications and, second, because of its effect upon civilian populations from which they hoped at some later time to receive cooperation in building for the future.

Even if Russia possesses the Atom Bomb, and about that there may be considerable doubt, it must always be remembered that Russia's objective is world power. They may regard it as possible to achieve that objective without arousing the undying hatred of those whose homes and cities they would destroy. As Russia is the only possible aggressor, this consideration may have some effect. They are well aware that the Nazi bombing of Rotterdam, of Belgrade, and other cities where scores of thousands of helpless civilians were slaughtered as acts of punishment, only served to create underground movements, which played a very great part in the ultimate destruction of Nazi power.

Russia may well rely on their vast military formations and almost as much upon the assistance of fifth columns, which have been able to organize so openly here in Canada and in all democratic countries.

It is to this last consideration that I wish to address my remarks. As President Truman has so simply said: "This is a struggle, above all else, for the minds of men." By every device of modern propaganda Russia is seeking to capture the minds of men and women throughout the world. Our problem is very different. We have little opportunity to reach the minds of the people of Russia. In any event, the people of Russia will have no say as to war or peace. That issue will be decided by the thirteen men in the Kremlin. The minds in Russia which must be impressed are the minds of the Members of the Politburo. If they think we are uncertain as to our course; that we are divided in our councils; or, above all, that the free nations would not act and act immediately to defend their freedom; then they might at any time decide to gamble with the largest masses of armed men that any nation has ever had under its command.

The truly terrible danger is that the men in the Kremlin will misunderstand us. To them every generous gesture, every effort toward reconciliation, is regarded as weakness on our part. Their signature on the charter of the United Nations was scarcely dry before they broke that solemn covenant in every essential detail. Since then, in spite of the agreement between all nations that they would respect the territorial integrity of every other nation, Russia has carried aggression farther than it has ever gone in a similar number of years. When the war ended one out of every twelve people in the world was under Communist domination. Today one out of every three is enslaved by that terrible tyranny. That is the dreadful but simple arithmetic of Communist aggression throughout the world.

The Red tide has been mounting steadily during these past five years. It has been moving one way all that time. Will it continue on the flood or will it finally recede? First it must be brought to a halt. When will that happen? A month, and only a month away, looms a date which may be decisive in world history. If the Communist plans for a march of five hundred thousand Germans from East Berlin to the Sportspalast does take place, it has been stated officially in Washington that machine gun and artillery will be used to stop them. This is all too reminiscent of what happened in the days before the last war. We wait for the development of remote events which may profoundly affect our whole future. Ours will not be the decision which will decide that event. What we do here in Canada, even in these few short weeks, may, however, in some small way, have a bearing on what will happen at that time.

To the extent that here and in every other democracy a determined stand is taken against Communism, the men in the Kremlin, with all the sources of information which we so conveniently provide for them, would know something of our determination to deal effectively with the fifth columns they are organizing here and elsewhere.

Defence of freedom starts at home. The place for us to begin dealing with Communism is in our own country. We must stop playing with Communism as if it were some ordinary political doctrine. Freedom was never intended to provide the means by which freedom could be destroyed. Every member of the Communist Party in Canada, as elsewhere, is a servant of the Kremlin. Every one of them is a traitor to Canada. Under clear and enforceable laws, it should be possible to deal with them as traitors before our courts.

In our apparent security we have been strangely tolerant of men like Tim Buck. Even though some people may have difficulty in getting passports, he receives a passport to go beyond the Iron Curtain to attend a meeting of the Cominform as the head of the Communist Party in Canada. That is not the tolerance of freedom. It is a tolerance of treachery.

Each nation must deal with Communism in its own way. We can contribute to the preservation of peace by leaving no doubt that here in Canada we intend to deal with the agents of the Kremlin in the way that traitors should be dealt with. That would help to impress the men in the Kremlin that we mean business. This procedure carried throughout all the free nations, far from provokiing hostilities, would indicate that measure of determination and firmness which they alone will recognize.

It is not only the openly-declared Communists with whom we have been far too tolerant. Yesterday the press carried the report of the statements of Dr. James Endicott, President of the Canadian Peace Congress, who has just returned from a visit to Russia.

We have been urged to carry on a campaign of truth. Truth demands that these organizations be described as what they really are and be dealt with in that way. Many innocent people are misled into participation in the affairs of this and similar organizations. The Canadian Peace

Congress is simply another Communist false front. There are many others of the same kind.

It is little use to carry on a campaign of truth in other countries unless we conduct the same campaign against the same enemy with equal vigour here at home. By all means, let us take our share of the effort to meet and overcome the lies and slanders of Communist propaganda in other lands. But, at the same time, let us not permit to pass unchallenged lies and slanders from the same source here in Canada.

Right here in Toronto there are publications in other languages than English or French which are filled with Communist propaganda. Week by week they do all within their power to undermine the faith in our institutions of those who have come to Canada from countries which speak different languages and have different forms of government. This is a double form of treachery. It seeks to make these newcomers active members of the Communist Fifth Column and, at the same time, tries to destroy their faith in Canada. Our laws should be so worded that publishers of publications of that kind could be dealt with and the publications suppressed under regular proceedings before our courts.

Communism should be tackled wherever it is met. Above all, we should combat its evil influence among our children. It is strangely inconsistent that we should wait in dreadful suspense while Communist Imperialist aggression strikes out in every direction, and at the same time, meekly permit their agents to work amongst our youth in an effort to destroy loyalty to our own country and enlist them as members of a treacherous Fifth Column.

This campaign of truth must be carried on in Parliament, in the press, over the radio, in our homes and in all our daily contacts. The strongest weapon of the democracies is the right to think, to speak and to act as free men and women. But that weapon is useful only if it is constantly employed. Freedom only as a word is of little value. It is the use of that freedom which gives it value and power. Let us all use that freedom as never before so that the cold, sharp scalpel of truth may cut away the cancer of Communism from the healthy body of Canadian life.

There is one truth above all others that we should keep before us at this time. In 1939, we promised that never again would the word "Appeasement" be written in letters of blood across the face of the world. We said we had learned our lesson. We said we knew that appeasement of the aggressor is the one sure way to war. Are we remembering that lesson today, or are we once again permitting the mumbo-jumbo of international diplomacy to hide reality from us.

Never in all history has any nation carried aggression so far in so short a time as has Russia in these past five years. Has Russia been brought to trial under the United Nations Charter? Everyone knows the answer. Russia has walked out on some twenty committees of the United Nations Organization because the other nations would not give Mao, the Chinese Communist puppet of the Kremlin, a seat on the security council. Was this attempted blackmail dealt with as it should have been? On the contrary, Mr. Tryvie Lie, the Secretary General of the United Nations, is going to discuss this subject with Stalin in the Kremlin. The road to Berchtesgaden may now be covered with grass, but it appears that there is to be a new road of humiliation and appeasement leading to Moscow. We know what happened after Chamberlain went to Berchtesgaden and Munich. The voices of free people everywhere should be raised immediately to warn Tryvie Lie not to march still further along that same road to the Kremlin. Appeasement of aggression and arrogant breach of international covenants can only lead to the same dreadful consequences.

All that I have said has been said in hope and not in despair. It is late, but not yet too late. We have means of communication by which the words of free people can be exchanged as never before. The peaceful weapons of freedom are there for our use. If we use them now with all the sense of urgency that the situation demands, the tide of Communist aggression may be halted and as it ebbs, freedom will march forward to brighter horizons with a newborn confidence in the power of freedom.

I have confidence that the cold war can still be won if we all stand firm. I would like to close these remarks with the lines written by Owen Seaman during the First World War. They express my own hope and confidence in the future.

Ye who have faith to look with dauntless eyes,
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife:
And know that out of night and death shall rise
The dawn of ampler life.
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you as a priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have your part
In freedom's Crowning Hour.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, TORONTO, ONTARIO
REPORTS AND ACCOUNTS
30th April, 1950

28th June, 1950

The President and Members of the Executive Committee,
The Empire Club of Canada,
Toronto, Ontario.

GENTLEMEN,

We have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1950, and have prepared and attach hereto a Statement of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 30th April, 1950.

We report thereon as follows:—

Membership Fees:

We are satisfied that, in total, all 1949-50 fees receivable from Members on record as in good standing as at 30th April, 1950, have been accounted for.

Membership Roll:

Following is a summary of the Membership Roll for the year:

	Resident	*Non-Resident*	*Honorary and Life*	*Total*
Membership Roll as at 30th April, 1949	1,288	56	20	1,364
Net Increase or *Decrease*	*20*	3	—	*17*
Membership Roll as at 30th April, 1950	1,268	59	20	1,347

The Treasurer has certified that the Roll as at 30th April, 1950, contained 1,347 Members as shown above.

Payments:

All payments made during the year were duly authorized by the Executive Committee.

Liabilities:

Mr. G. A. Lascelles, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, has certified that outstanding accounts as at 30th April, 1950, totalled $10.64.

Fidelity Bond:

Mr. W. W. Comber, the Treasurer, is bonded for $500.00.

Insurance:

Office Furniture is covered by a fire insurance policy in the amount of $485.00.

Acknowledgment:

We express our appreciation of the courtesy and assistance extended to us by the Treasurer during the course of our audit.

Reported by,

H. T. JAMIESON LEMAY & COMPANY,
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Honorary Auditors.

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1950

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1949				$2,065.69
RECEIPTS				
Membership Fees		$5,285.00		
Extra Contributions from Members		4.00		
Proceeds of Sale of Year Book		31.63		
Interest:				
On Investments	$ 45.00			
On Bank Balance	43.68			
		$ 88.68		
			$5,409.31	
PAYMENTS				
Luncheon Expenses	$6,514.03			
Less:				
Proceeds of Sale of Tickets	5,923.80			
		$ 590.23		
Honoraria:				
Secretary	$ 625.00			
Treasurer	200.00			
		$ 825.00		
Miscellaneous Expense		159.90		
Printing, Stationery and Postage		1,351.17		
Printing, 1948-1949 Year Book		2,059.16		
Recording and Publicity		156.08		
Speakers' Fees and Expenses		192.85		
Telephone and Telegraph		124.30		
			$5,458.69	
Excess of Payments over Receipts				49.38
Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1950				$2,016.31

We report that we have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1950, and have obtained all the information and explanations we have required, and that, in our opinion, the above Statement shows correctly the Receipts and Payments of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1950.

In addition to the Cash Balance of $2,016.31, the Club holds $1,500.00 Dominion of Canada 3% Ninth Victory Loan Bonds due 1st September, 1966.

As at 30th April, 1950, the Club was committed to publish the 1949-1950 Year Book at an estimated cost of $2,250.00.

H. T. JAMIESON LEMAY & COMPANY,
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Honorary Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario.
28th June, 1950.

"THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA"

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

*1903-1912	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1913-1926	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
*1927-1931	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.
*1935-1940	Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir, G.C.M.G., C.H.
1940-46	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Athlone, K.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., D.S.O., V.D.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

*1902-05	Brig.-Gen. James Mason
*1905-06	Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1906-07	J. P. Murray, Esq.
1907-08	J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
*1908-09	D. J. Goggin, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.
1909-10	Elias Clouse Esq., M.D., C.M., L.F.P.S. Glasgow, L.R.C.P.S. Edin.
*1910-11	J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.R.S.
*1911-12	F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
*1912-13	Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
*1913-14	Mr. Justice James Craig
*1914-15	Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart
*1915-16	Albert Ham, Esq., Mus. Doc.
*1916-17	James Black Perry, Esq.
*1917-18	Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
1918	F. J. Coombs, Esq.
1919	R. A. Stapells, Esq.
*1920	Arthur Hewitt, Esq.
*1921	Brig. Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
*1922	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923	Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
*1924	William Brooks, Esq.
*1925	Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
1926	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C., V.D.
*1927	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
1928	Robert H. Fennell, Esq., K.C.
*1929	Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
*1930	John D. Spence, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1931	H. G. Stapells, Esq., K.C.
1932-33	Col. The Hon. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
1933-34	Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.
1934-35	Hon. Dana H. Porter, K.C.

* Deceased.

1935-36	J. H. Brace, Esq.
*1936-37	Major G. B. Balfour, B.A., K.C.
1937-38	Major R. M. Harcourt
1938-39	J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.
*1939-40	F. A. Gaby, Esq., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.
*1940-41	The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, P.C. (Can), K.C.
1941-42	C. R. Sanderson, Esq., M.A., B.Sc.
1942-43	John C. M. MacBeth, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1943-44	W. Eason Humphreys, Esq.
1944-45	Charles R. Conquergood, Esq.
1945-46	Eric F. Thompson, Esq.
1946-47	Major F. L. Clouse
1947-48	Tracy E. Lloyd, Esq.
1948-49	Thos. H. Howse, Esq.
1949-50	H. G. Colebrook, Esq.

*Deceased.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Officers and Executive Committee

Year 1950-1951

Officers:

President: Sydney Hermant
First Vice-President: Warren B. Hastings
Second Vice-President: R. Ford Ralph
Third Vice-President: Brig. Colin A. Campbell, D.S.O., O.B.E.
Secretary: Ernest Miles
Honorary-Treasurer: W. W. Comber, C.A.
Honorary Auditor: H. T. Jamieson, F.C.A.

Executive Committee:

Col. F. F. Arnoldi, D.S.O.
H. C. Bourlier
R. N. Bryson
Dr. Clarence Crummey
S. S. Fletcher
D. H. Gibson
John W. Griffin
Horace Harpham
George Hardy
Lt.-Col. N. D. Hogg, M.B.E.
Arthur E. M. Inwood
H. R. Jackman
James H. Joyce
Norman A. Keys, K.C.
G. A. Lascelles
David G. C. Menzel
John Wm. Perry

Immediate Past President:

H. G. Colebrook

Past Presidents:

Thos. H. Howse
Tracey E. Lloyd
J. P. Pratt, K.C.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members,
(e) Associate Members,
(f) Corporate or Sustaining Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes (a), (b), (c), (d) and (f) must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meetitng of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article Active Resident and Associate members shall pay an annual fee of $5.00 and Non-Resident members $3.00, payable on or before the first day of October in each year. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of September in the following calendar year.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Honorary Members

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Corporate or Sustaining Members

Art. 5A—Any company, partnership or business organization shall be eligible for election as a Corporate or Sustaining Member. Applicants shall be proposed by two Active Resident Members of the Club in good standing and the application shall contain the name and position of the Officer nominated by the Applicant as its Candidate for membership. The Applicant and its Nominee shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee. A Sustaining or Corporate Member shall pay an annual fee of $50.00 which shall include the fee of its representative member.

Officers to Be Elected

Art. 6—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-Presidents; an Honorary Treasurer, or a Treasurer, or both; an Honorary Secretary or a Secretary, or both; an Executive Committee which shall consist of the officers appointed under this Article and 17 other members, who, with the officers, shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. There may also be elected an Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer. Three Past Presidents together with the immediate Past President shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 30 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. The Officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office until April 30th, of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A Nominating Committee consisting of five members of the Executive Committee and four other members (this Committee shall select its own Chairman) shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and ap-

proved at a regular or special meeting of the Club not less than four and not more than six weeks before such Annual meeting, due notice of such regular or special meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such Committee shall report to the Annual Meeting. If nominations do not exceed the number of the officers and members of the Executive Committee necessary under the Constitution, the President shall instruct the Secretary to cast one ballot in favour of those so nominated and thereupon such persons shall be declared by the President to have been duly elected.

(3) An Auditor or Honorary Auditor shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:

- (a) Budget and Finance Committee.
- (b) Speakers' Committee.
- (c) Membership Committee.
- (d) Constitution Committee.
- (e) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
- (f) Publicity Committee.
- (g) Year Book Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the Officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly, if possible, from October to April, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. An audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year shall be published in the Year Book.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special, and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Nine members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

MEMBERSHIP

as at April 30, 1950

LIFE MEMBERS

Bickell, J. P.
Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert
Clouse, Dr. Elias
Clouse, F. L.
Cobham, Arthur H.
Coombs, F. J.
Johnson, E. E.
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
Maher, James P.
Murdoch, J. Y., K.C., LL.D.
Sandy, J.
Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, H. G. K.C.
Stapells, R. A.
Stewart, J. F. M.
Tindall, H. B.
Wilson, Col. J. E.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Bourlier, H. C.
Geary, Major B. Handley, V.C.
Gillespie, Lt.-Col. George H.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Ahern, E. G.
Alexander, R. W.
Baker, Robert P.
Beaumont, Arthur
Black, H. H.
Boag, Ernest C.
Bradley, Bruce H.
Bradley, E.
Cranstoun, John A.
Davidson, George MacK.
Davis, Aubrey
Duff, R. B.
Dutton, B. A.
Empringham, John R.
Fitzsimmons, R. H.
Gilbert, C. A.
Hale, C. Harold
Hale, J. R.
Hitchcock, C. H.
Hooper, Col. B. O., D.S.O., M.C.
Hudson, J. P.
Hughes, Gordon R.
Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
Hutcheson, Frank W.
Jackson, E. H.
Jackson, George B.
Jamieson, Fraser
Johnston, R. C.
Kendall, Philip F. J.
Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
Kimpton, J. R.
Leather, Harold H.
Leyden, C.
Lovell, E. A.
MacLennan, H. Alexander
MacRae, John
Martin, Victor, M.P.P.
McCulley, Joseph
McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
Medland, C. R.
Moffat, John A.
Newman, J. M., M.P.P.
Norman, J.
Opie, R. P.
Over, Spencer Henry, C.A.
Preston, J. H.
Prince, Col. Alan C.
Pugsley, T. Aubrey

Raycroft, R. I.
Reid, J. K.
Rice, H. E.
Robinson, W. E.
Ryan, John
Slatkin, Alfred D.
Thompson, J. R.
Tupper, Charles
Whitmore, Harold
Wideman, Harvey
Wilson, Thomas L.
Wood, Chester F.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Charles E.
Ackehurst, A. V.
Adair, Herbert E.
Adams, G. W.
Adams, J. C.
Affleck, A.
Agar, Norman E.
Alberts, Edgar T.
Alexander, John B.
Alexander, Robert
Allanson, Harry E.
Allen, Thomas
Allnutt, Rev. F. B., D.TH.
Ander, J.
Anderson, C. Harry
Anderson, E. H.
Anderson, J. Murray
Anderton, L.
Andrecheck, E. J.
Angus, W. Harry
Appleton, C. N.
Argo, J. A.
Armstrong, J. H.
Arnoldi, Col. F. F., D.S.O. & BAR
Ash, W. M. V.
Askin, R. J.
Assheton-Smith, J. E.
Atkinson, F. L.

Babbitt, G. W.
Babcock, Harold A.
Bailey, Baldwin W.
Bailey, William Gill
Bain, H. R.
Bainard, R. H.
Baker, Col. E. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, George A.
Baldwin, Charles O.
Balfour, Keith C.
Ballard, B. W.
Band, Charles S.
Barber, George
Barber, John R.
Barber, William
Bark, W. A.
Barrett, Brian N.
Barrett, William W.
Barrow, H. E.
Bartholomew, F. W. E.
Bartley, George E.
Bartman, G. M.
Bassett, John
Bate, William B.
Bates, William D.
Batten, Reg. A.
Baxter, Major James
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beardmore, S. H.
Beaton, John W.
Beatty, C. W.
Beatty, Dr. H. A., M.R.C.S.
Beatty, J. G.
Bedford, James H.
Bedford, Morley S.
Bedolfe, Robert D.
Beeston, George H.
Begley, George E.
Bell, Lt.-Col. Arthur A.
Bell, Dr. W. J.
Bennett, A. B.
Bennett, E. J. F.C.A.
Bennett, Major James W.
Bennett, Brig. Peter W. C.A.
Benson, D. F.
Berkinshaw, R. C.
Best, Douglas W.
Best, Gordon H.
Best, T. Harrison
Best, T. W.
Betts, D. Clive
Bickle, E. W.

Bingham, Rev. Dr. H. H.
Bishop, Colonel A. L.
Bishop, H. H.
Bishop, Percy W.
Blackwell, H. W.
Blackwell, Hon. Leslie E.
Blake, Parker G.
Blenkinship, C. S.
Blight, W. Rae.
Blue, M. F.
Boase, J. B.
Boehm, A. Fred
Bogart, Ernest C., K.C.
Bogert, C. A.
Bolger, H. N.
Bomby, W. S.
Bone, Fred A.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Booth, E. H.
Bottrill, E. A.
Bourne, W. T. H.
Boustred, R. Warren
Boxer, Reginald N.
Boylen, Major J. C.
Boyter, J. B. C.A.
Brandon, N. D.
Britnell, Robert G.
Brittain, Dr. Horace L.
Blocklebank, Frank
Brockwell, Meredith
Brooke, Arthur T.
Brookes, Air Vice Marshal G.E.
Brown, F. Irving
Brown, James N. M.
Brown, Murray
Brown, Ross S.
Brown, Stuart H.
Brown, W. E.
Browne, R. J.
Bryce, Very Rev. Peter, D.D.
Bryce, Robert A.
Bryson, R. N.
Burgess, John H.
Burke, E. T. C.
Burnett, E. R.
Burns, H. D.
Burt, A. W.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.
Burton, G. Allan
Bush, Clayton E.
Bushnell, Wm. J.
Buyers, Russell W.
Byrne, A. T.

Calder, B. R.
Calvin, C. C. K.C.
Cameron, A. J.
Cameron, Harry
Campbell, C. R.
Campbell, Brig. Colin A.
Campbell Dr. D. M.
Campbell, E. M.
Cape, J. R.
Capell, S. L.
Carey, A. R.
Carl, Gordon A.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carlyle, D. B.
Carnegie, F. T.
Carnegie, N. F.
Carr, E. F.
Carr, John Bulloch
Carr, Walter D.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carriere S. W.
Carroll, Frank J.
Carscallen, H. M., K.C.
Carson, C. E.
Carson, James L.
Carter, F. H.
Carthy, Dr. W. C.
Cartwright, Brig. Gen. G. S.
Case, Everett J.
Cassels, J. Graham
Cassidy, Frank C.
Cassidy, H. F.
Caulder, J. A.
Chadwick, William
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chappell, H. L.
Charles, Leo E.
Chater, Harold T.
Chenoweth, Dr. T. Oswald
Chester, Lane R. C.A.
Chillman, Harry E.

Chipman, Lt.-Col. J. H.
Chisholm, Lt.-Col. G. T.
Chisholm, W.
Clark, C. T.
Clark, John G.
Clark, Dr. William J.
Clark, W. R.
Clarke, E. R.
Clarke, W. H.
Clemes, J. C.
Close, Marshall
Clouse, Geoffrey L.
Cobb, Christopher J.
Cockburn, Blake A.
Cockell, J. Horace
Cody, Hon. and Rev. H.J., C.M.G.
Coke, Major E. F.
Colberg, A. M.
Colby, S. A.
Cole, Joseph A.
Colebrook, H. G.
Coles, Gordon E.
Coles, Kenneth
Collett, David B.
Collington, George E.
Comber, W. W., C.A.
Conant, Hon. Gordon D., K.C.
Connolly, C. P.
Conquergood, C. R.
Conquergood, J. N.
Coon, H. J.
Cork, J. Milton
Cornish, F. Joseph
Cornish, Prof. G. A.
Corrigan, Dr. C. A.
Corrigan, Fred S.
Corson, R. R.
Cosgrave, Rev. Dr. F. H.
Cottrelle, G. R.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Courtice, A. Roy
Coutts, William E.
Cowan, P. J.
Cowell, John F.
Coyle, J. P.
Coyne, Gordon
Craft, George B.
Craick, W. A.
Craig, Lt.-Col. John A. D., C.A.
Crang, J. H.
Crawford, F. J.
Crawford, N. R.
Crawford-Brown, Lyman
Creighton, Arthur H.
Crighton, A. S.
Cross, William B.
Crossin, H. W.
Crossingham, J. H.
Crummey, Dr. Clarence B.

Daly R. A.
Daly, Roland O.
Dargavel, R. B.
Davidson, J. B.
Davies, H. E.
Davis, Bertram N.
Davis, Bruce P., K.C.
Davis, C. B.
Davis, George A.
Davis, George D.
Davis, R. Reade
Davis, W. H.
Davis, Walter W.
Davison, Martin A.
Dawson, J. H.
Day, Robert E.
Day, W. D.
Deacoff, G. A.
DE Galatoff, A. N.
Demcoe, J. W.
Dent, C. R.
Despard, W. H.
Detweiler, W. O.
de Veber, L. S.
Dewar, A. M.
DeWitt, Prof. N. W.
Dickey, A. J.
Dicks, A. W. F.
Dies, W. C.
Dilworth, W. A.
Diven, Robert E.
Dix, William B.
Dockstader, J. A.
Dodd, George W. W.
Dodgson, Major E. B.
Doleman, A. J.

Dolson, Dr. Wilbur J. M.
Donaldson, John
Doran, F. C.
Douglas, Howard R.
Downie, Campbell F.
Draimin, Charles
Dray Lt.-Col. W. J.
Druckman, S.
Duckworth, Lloyd
Duffett, Norman G.
Duke, A. A.
Duke, S. A.
Duncan, James S.
Duncan, S. F.
Dunham, Lt.-Col. F. H.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunlap, D. M.
Dunn, Norman M.
Dunn, William
Dunsmore, Clinton P.
Durance, John J.
Dutton, Thomas M.
Dye, Harold E.

Eager, King
Eakin, Joseph S.
Eastmure, A. W.
Easton, J.
Eaton, Col. R. Y.
Eby, H. D.
Edmonds, C. E.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey, F.C.A.
Edwards, H. Percy, F.C.A.
Edwards, Lt.-Col. W. F. L.
Elgie, G. C., K.C.
Elliot, B. V.
Elliott, Charles R. C.A.
Elliott, G. N.
Ellis, C. Q.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, Edward H.
England, Charles
Enman, H. L.
Entwistle, John S.
Epstein, Morris H.
Ezrin, Maurice

Faber, George
Faber, R. W.
Fairclough, R. P.
Fairs, C. G.
*Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Fennell, Robert H. K.C.
Fenwick, Gordon
Ferguson, H. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, M.
Fessenden, C. V.
Field, R. W. A.
Findlay, Major D. M.
Finlay, Fred J.
Firstbrook, Hugh M.
Fisher, A. B.
Fisher, Frank
Fisher, J. W.
Fishman, Philip
Fleming, Donald M., M.P.
Fleming, Major Robert
Fletcher, S. S.
Flynn, J.
Forrester, William J.
Foster, G. R. S.
Fox, E. D.
Frame, S. J.
Frankel, Roy H.
Frankling, T. H.
Fraser, John A.
Frazer, A. W.
Freyseng, Willis P.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.
Fulford, R. T.
Fyfe, J. Allan
Fyvie, J. M.

Gairdner, J. A.
Garber, Frank
Gardiner, F. G. K.C.
Gardiner, H. H.
Gardiner, Percy R.
Garfunkel, Capt. B. H.
Garrett, Albert H.
Gathercole, George E.
Gaunt, J. William

*Deceased

Geary, J. J.
Geggie, Thomas P., C.A.
Genovese, Frank A.
Gerow, Frank T.
Gervais, Paul E.
Gianelli, Brig. Norman A.
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibb, W. Kenneth
Gibbens, W. M.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, E. H.
Gibson, Robert C.
Gibson, William S.
Gilbride, W. P.
Gilchrist, Dr. A. J.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Giles, T. S. H.
Gill, E. C.
Gillard, Harry R.
Gillespie, Dugald L.
Gillespie, R.
Gillespie, William
Gillett, L. G.
Glennie, George H. C.A.
Gohn, Byron E.
Goldring, Dr. C. C.
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, M. Ross, K.C.
Gooding, T. W.
Goodman Edwin A.
Gordon, George
Gordon, H. G.
Gordon, William E.
Gosselin, F. F.
Gostling, Brig. G. S. N.
Gould, J. Lyall S.
Gowdy, D. M.
Graham, D. M.
Graham, Kingsley, K.C.
Graham, J. Lindsay
Grainger, R. N.
Grand, Percy F.
Grant, J. R.
Grant, J. W.
Grant, W. G. F.
Grattan, William R. B.
Gravely, J. F.
Greatrex, S. H.
Green, J. D.
Grier, A. Monro, K.C.
Griffin, J. W.
Griffith, W. L.
Griffiths, F. D.
Grimbly, Maurice
Grisdale, C. L.
Grose, George W.
Grove, Anthony A.
Guest, A. E.
Guest, Wm. C.
Gully, Harold M.
Gundy, C. L.
Gundy, J. H.
Gunn, Major General John A.
Gunyon, C. Cecil

Hair, Dr. C. H.
Hall, Howard A.
Hall, I. C.
Hall, William
Hallarn, W. J.
Ham, C. N.
Ham, E. F.
Hambly, Herbert
Hambourg, Boris
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamlin, Dr. Fred V.
Hammell, J. E.
Hanna, William B.
Harbinson, V. D. F.C.A.
Harcourt, Major R. M.
Harding, Paul S.
Hardy, George
Hardy, H. R.
Hargraft, W. M.
Harman, H. M.
Harpham, Cecil
Harpham, Horace
Harris, Joseph H.
Harrison, James F.
Harrison, Kenneth J.
Harrison, W. E.
Harron, Hal S.
Harton, E. Douglas
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Harvey, Warren G.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.

Hatch, Carr
Hatton, Edward
Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, V. S. G.
Hay, Frank
Hayden, Hon. Salter A. K.C.
Hayes, Barry B.
Hayward, A. P.
Heagerty, Leo J.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Hemmerick, George
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Herbinson, William
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Hermant, Sydney
Herod, Wesley J.
Heywood, P. K.
Hicks-Lyne, R. T. E.
Higgins, Fred Page, F.C.A.
Highmoor, C. K.
Hilborn, Melvin, C.A.
Hill, E. E.
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, John D.
Hill, Roy C.
Hillmer, R. W.
Hillock, James
Hodgins, Albert
Hoffman, Howard B.
Hogan, Alfred H.
*Hogarth, D. M.
Hogg, N. D., M.B.E.
Holliss, J. F.
Holtzman, M. E.
Honey, Dr. E. M.
Hooker, Edwin R. K.
Hookway, C. W.
Hopkins, Howard
Hopkins, Oliver B.
Hopkins, Percy E.
Horne, J. V.
Hornell, Allen
Hotrum, Frederick
Houghton, E. O.
Houghton, W. R.
Houston, H. T.
Howard, Clifford H.

*Deceased

Howden, Rev. H. R.
Howe, H. J.
Howse, Thomas H.
Huckvale, Robert
Hudspeth, Rev. W. H., M.B.E.
Huffman, George E.
Hugill, Albert E.
Hugill, W. M.
Hulbig, F. M.
Hull, Rodney
Humphrey, Dr. John N.
Humphries, Charles K.
Humphreys, W. Eason
Humphries, W. R. B.
Hunt, A. T.
Hunt, John F.
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter, Donald F.
Hunter, E. J.
Hunter, H. T.
Hunter, K. M., C.A.
Hurlbut, C. A.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchinson, J. D. H.
Hutchison, O. A.
Hyde, F. C. W.

Inglis, M. Osborne
Inwood, Arthur E. M.
Irving, J. D.

Jackman, H. R.
Jackson, Charles W.
Jackson, L. G.
Jacob, E. R.
Jaffray, W. G.
James, T. B.
Jamieson, H. T. F.C.A.
Jamieson, John D.
Janes, Gordon
Jarvis, H. St. J.
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jenney, H. B.
Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
Jephcott, Gerald, F.C.A.
Johnston, Lt.-Col. Baptist
Johnston, E. Graham
Johnston, Eldon
Johnston, Erskine B.

Johnston, G. F.
Johnston, O. D.
Johnston, William R.
Jolliffe, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Jones, Frank
Jones, G. J. L.
Jones, Gordon
Jones, Gordon
Jones, Terence L.
Jones, W. D.
Jowett, T. Robert
Joyce, James H.
Jupp, Donald H., O.B.E.

Kasman, Philip
Kay, Edwin
Keefler, Lt.-Col. J. K.
Keenleyside, H. B.
Keir, William
Kelley, Hon. Russell T.
Kellow, Ralph S.
Kelly, M. J.
Kelson, Harry L.
Kennedy, David Lawson
Kennedy, George H.
Kent, James Palmer
Kerr, A. B.
Kerr, Rev. D. M.
Kerr, John E.
Kerr, P. Gordon J.
Kerr, W. R.
Keys, Norman A.
Kidd, David
Kindersley, C. M.
Kinghorn, A. A.
Kingsmill, Charles D'Arcy
Kingsmill, Nicol
Kinnear, T. Clark, C.A.
Kinsman, J. Victor
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kitchen, Dr. Irving D.

Labbett, B. G.
LaBine, Gilbert
La Ferle, Charles
Laffey, J. V.
Laing, G. Blair
Lamb, Rev. Canon P. M.
Lambert, George
Lang, James
Langan, Frederick J.
Langlois, John W.
Langlois, M. G.
Lapp, Dr. John S.
Larry, Leo J.
Lascelles, G. A.
Latimer, H. B.
Lavine, Arthur
Lawrie, Donald L.
Lawson, Frank G.
Leacock, George D.
Leibel, Dr. Bernard
Leibel, William
Leishman, Edward E.
Leitch, G. C.
Leith, M. A.
Lemon, W. E.
Lennie, E. D.
Lesco, Dr. S. J.
Levenston, Lt.-Col. G. F.
Levy, Mark
Levy, Mort. L.
Lewis, Robert
Lindsay, G. C.
Lindsay, W. W.
Linton, Hall
Lister, M. Parker
Lithgow, J. H.
Little, F. M.
Little, William
Livingston J. A.
Livingston, Wm. R.
Lloyd, T. E.
Lofft, H. W.
Logan, S. H.
Logie, Ernest R.
Long, Clinton E.
Lount, H. M.
Lovering, His Honor Judge Egerton
Lucas, F. O.
Lucas, Roy
Lumbers, G. C.
Lundberg, Hans
Lyons, John W.
Lyons, Lt.-Col. S. E.

Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
MacBeth, John C. M., K.C.
MacBrien, James R.
MacBrien, W. A. H.
Macdiarmid, W. J. G.
MacDonald, Arthur A.
Macdonald, Charleton E.
MacDonald, Dr. H. S.
MacDonald, J. K.
Macdonnell, H. W.
MacEachern, Gordon A.
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacInnes, Col. C. S., K.C.
MacKay, Hon. Mr. Justice J. Keiller
MacKelcan, Fred R.
Mackellar, S. R.
MacKenzie, C. Logie
MacKenzie, Ian D.
Mackey, Wallace A.
Maclachlan, Wills
MacLaren, Ian
MacLean, Commander A. D. R.C.N.V.R.
MacLean, Lt.-Col. J. B.
MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
MacMillan, William
*MacNicol, John R., M.P.
Macphee, Norman
Macpherson, Alex F.
Macrae, E. M.
MacRae, F. J.
MacTaggart, J. A.
Mactaggart, Rev. Dr. W. A.
Magi, M. I.
Male, W. Harold
Mallison, Fred
Mancantelli, Robert
Manning, H. B.
Mantle, S. R.
Manton, Frank
Marchment, W. R.
Mark, Howard S.
Markon, K.
Marsh, John A.
Marshall, E. H.
Marshall, George A.
Marshall, G. R.
*Deceased

Marshall, Col. K. R.
Marshall, W. Norman
Martin, Magistrate O. M.
Martin, S. O.
Mason, V. K.
Massey, Denton
Massie, R. H. L.
Matthews, C. F.
Matthews, C. Syd.
Matthews, F. Beverley, K.C.
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, Paul W.
Maxwell, Frank D.
May, George E. I.
Maynard, Robert B.
McAuley, M. G.
McAteer, W. B.
McAvoy, Louis Peter
McBain, Alex.
McBain, Brig. Robert, S.A.
McCaffrey, E. R.
McCamus, T. D.
McCarthy, D'Alton
McCarthy, John
McCarthy, Leigh M.
McCarthy, Hon. Leighton
McCartney, W. S.
McCaul, L. F.
McCausland, J. K.
McClatchie, John, C.A.
McClellan, W. H.
McClelland, D. McK., F.C.A.
McCloskey, H. C.
McColl, Hugh
McCrae, W. H.
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, Hon. Charles
McCrea, J. G.
McCrea, T. Arthur
McCrimmon, D. A.
McCullagh, C. G.
McDonald, D. F.
McDougall, R. G. M.
McDowell, George
McFadden, Harold W.
McGaw, A. F.
McGillivray, Dr. Donald
McGillivray, T. A.
McGinnis, S. L.

McGowan, James R
McHardy, R. A.
McIntosh, A. N.
McKay, Will G.
McKay-Clements, J. L.
McKee, A. D.
McKee, John W.
McKellar, A. R.
McKenzie, C.
McKerrow, J. O.
McKinnon, W. L.
McLaren, J. B.
McLean, Donald E.
McLean, J. S.
McLeod, W. N.
McMahon, S.
McMillen, John B.
McNamara, George A.
McNeil, W. G.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, George G.
McPherson, R. S., F.C.A.
McRostie, J. E.
McSporran, Malcolm
McTavish, C. E.
McVey, Roy A.
McWilliams, D. B.
Medhurst, C. E. H.
Medland, J. A.
Medland, T. J.
Meech, R. G., K.C.
Meggeson, J. R.
Mellish, A. E.
Menzel, D. G. C.
Menzies, Harold
Menzies, Thomas E.
Meredith, Arthur
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Mess, Brigadier James
Michell, C. A.
Middleton, Lt. Hugh C., R.C.N.
Might, P. G.
Miles, Arthur W.
Miles, Ernest
Miller, Andrew
Miller, Charles T.
Miller, P. C.
Miller, T. D.
Milliken, Walter T.
Milling, Ernest R.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, A. R.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, Charles
Mitchell, Dr. E. W.
Mitchell, William G.
Mitchell, Lt.-Col. W. G.
Moffat, D. R.
Moffat, John H.
Moffat, Norman D.
Moncur, W. L.
Monks, R. C.
Montgomery, Dr. Robert C.
Moore, F.
Moore, G. F.
Moore, H. Napier
Moore, R. C.
More, W. G.
Morgan, J.
Morgan, Marcel T.
Morgan, William S.
Morley, Frank
Morley, Gerald W.
Morley, Lloyd O.
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morris, G. F.
Morrison, Lt.-Col. L. S.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, G. A.
Mortimer, J. A.
Mudie, Hubert C. P.
Mugford, Sidney H.
Muir, William G.
Muirhead, W. T.
Mulock, Col. The Hon. W. P.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Munn, Charles H.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Murphy, A. P.
Murphy, Thomas A.
Murray, Major Gladstone
Murray, H. W.
Mutch, C. M.
Myers, Rev. A. J. W.
Mylrea, A. J.

Nash, Gerald
Neale, A.

*Needham, C. F.
Neelands, E. V.
Neil, William S.
Neilly, Balmer
Neilson, Charles
Nesbitt, Russell, K.C.
New, Ryland H.
Newbegin, L. R.
Newell, John O.
Newman, Harry A.
Newman, T. C.
Newport, W. R.
Newth, Reg. W.
Nichol, George H.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, James
Nicol, John P.
Nightingale, George F.
Noble, Wilfred G.
Nock, Harry
Noltie, I. N. R.
Norman, Harold F.
Northway, A. G.
Nunn, Herbert G., C.A.
Nunn, Norman A.
Nunns, Gilbert

Oakley, Thomas
O'Brian, R. B.
O'Brien, G. E.
O'Connor, W. M.
Oglesby, W. V.
O'Kell, J. R.
Oldfield, Harold G.
Oldham, Harry
Olivella, Robert H.
Olver, Lt.-Col. E. A., D.S.O., V.D.
Omand, J. N
Omejer, Capt. Odegard
Orliffe, Herbert
Orr, W. A.
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osbourn, A. J.
Ostrom, W. R.
Owen, G. H.
Owens, C. L.

Page, William A.

Pakes, S. A.
Palm, William H.
Palmer, H. A.
Parish, M. C.
Parker, Dr. Charles B.
Parkinson, N. F.
Parks, Capt. Arthur H.
Parsons, Robert C.
Parsons, Robert S., Jr.
Partridge, A. G.
Paterson, A. S.
Paterson, E., C.A.
Paterson, James G.
Paterson, J. McPherson
Patrick, W. G.
Patten, Edward
Patterson, R. E.
Patterson, W. E.
Pattison, Dr. C. L.
Paul, George
Peacock, Col. G. W., C.B.E.
Peacock, H. Charles
Peak, Paul S.
Pearce, C. T.
Pearce, N. C.
Pearce, R. John
Pearcey, Samuel E.
Pearson, Gerald F.
Pearson, P. C.
Peckover, Cecil R.
Peckover, George
Pennington, Roy O.
Pepall, George T.
Perrin, Major J. G.
Perry, Gordon F.
Perry, H. M.
Perry, John William
Perry, N. R.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Pettit, Holland Jr.
Phimister, Z. S.
Pickup, J. D.
Pickup, J. W., K.C.
Pike, Harry A.
Pike, Theodore
Plantner, J. F.
Playfair, S. B.
Playter, W. P.
Pooler, E. H.

*Deceased

Porter, Hon. D. H.
Porter, Dr. George D.
Poucher, F. B.
Poupore, Lt.-Col. A. G.
Powell, R. H.
Powley, J.
Pratt, J. P. K.C.
Prentice, Magistrate John L.
Prentice, Victor F.
Price, Vincent, K.C.
Price, Lieut.-Col. W. H.
Priestman, R. B.
Proverbs, C. I.
Pullan, Harry
Pullen, Frank
Purcell, Gillis

Quinn, Gordon W.

Rae, Robert
Rae, W. J.
Ralph, R. Ford
Ramsay, Victor R.
Rankin, Donald O., B.A.
Ransom, A. C.
Rawsthorn, Albert P.
Rea, Charles E.
Reburn, E. G.
Reddrop, F. O.
Reed, Col. Le Grand
Rees, S. L.
Reeve, Fred J.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Loftus H.
Reid, Morgan
Reid, Dr. Spence
Reilly, J. A. B.
Reilly, Leonard M.
Rennie, G. H.
Rennie, Thomas
Reynolds, S. B.
Riddell, Frank A.
Riley, Very Rev. Dean
Ripley, Bruce T.
Ritchie, Robert T.
Robarts, John A.
Robbins, W. D.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, C. Percy, F.C.A.
Roberts, F. E., F.C.A.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Douglas S.
Robertson, Duncan
Robertson, John F.
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. G.
Robinette, George W.
Robinette, T. L.
Robinson, G. G.
Robinson, W. G. W.
Robinson, W. J.
Robinson, W. W.
Roewade, O.
Rogers, Alfred
Rogers, H. A.
Rogers, H. L.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. Grenville
Rooke, L. L.
Rooney, J. H.
Rose, G. H.
Ross, Alexander P.
Ross, Douglas G.
Rotenberg, Harry I.
Routley, Dr. F. W.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Roxborough, E. L.
Ruddy, E. L.
Rupert, H. S.
Russell-Murray, J., C.A.
Rutherford, W. S.

Sachs, W. R.
St. Lawrence, F.
Salter, W. R.
Samuel, Sigmund, LL.D.
Sanders, C. J.
Sanders, Wilfrid
Sanderson, C. R.
Sandwell, B. K.
Sargeant, E. S.
Sarjeant, Dr. P. A.
Saunders, Robert H.
Saunders, Sydney B.
Sawers, Ven. Archdeacon, F. J.
Scherer, Joseph
Scheuer, Edmund Jr.

Scheuer, Isadore S.
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, Fred
Scott, S. C., C.A.
Scott, W. P.
Scott, W. S.
Scruton, J. F.
Scythes, R. L.
Seagram, J. W.
Seale, Leslie H.
Seccombe, W. Wallace
Sedgwick, Harry
Sedgwick, Joseph
Seeley, Rev. R. S. K., D.D.
Sellers, W. F. C.
Semmons, Frank F.
Shakespeare, W. C., C.A.
Sharp, Major J. McA.
Sharpe, Charles T.
Shaver, Edward B. H.
Shea, Orville G.
Shenstone, Dr. Norman
Sheppard, G. H.
Sherbut, James
Sherk, Frank T.
Shiach, Harold A., F.C.A.
Shiels, M. S.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Shore, B. E.
Sibbald, S. J.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Simons, D. J.
Simpson, James I.
Sims, R. L.
Sinclair, Gordon
Singer, J. G.
Singh, Gurpal
Skey, W/C L. W. M.P.
Slater, Leslie George
Sloan, W. G.
Small, R. Hardy
Smellie, Ian M.
*Smith, A. Bayard
Smith, A. L.
Smith, Ewen G.
Smith, Gordon
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Harry R.
Smith, Irving D.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, S. E. V., C.A.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, Dr. Sidney
Smith, S. Titchener
Smith, W. C.
Snively, Major A. C.
Snowdon, C. Allen
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Southall, H. L.
Spence, Dr. R. J.
Spence, Dr. W. A.
Spooner, C. H.
Sprague, H. S.
Spooner, Lt.-Col. R. T.
Springer, D. M.
Springett, Rev. E. J.
Sproule, M. L.
Stalker, N. O.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Staples, W. W.
Steiner, E. A.
Stephens, H. A.
Stephenson, H. R.
Sterling, Stanley C.
Stevens, H. R.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, D. E.
Stewart, Dunlop
Stewart, Wm. J., O.B.E.
Stodart, D. H.
Stoddart, George W.
Stoddart, W. H.
Stokes-Rees, Cdr. R. H.
Stoneman, Harry P.
Stovel, Wilfrid C.
Strathdee, Gordon
Strong, Gerald
Stuart, J. Cecil
Sturtridge, W. C.
Summers, G. F.
Switzer, Brig. T. D.
Sword, Colin E.
Symons, H. L.

Talbot, Alfred M.
Taylor, Charles W.

*Deceased

Taylor, D. R.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, J. R. K.
Taylor, Reginald W.
Tedman, Harry M.
Therrien, James A.
Thomas, H. O.
Thomas, R. H.
Thompson, Arthur C.
Thompson, A. M.
Thompson, A. O.
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, George W.
Thompson, Gordon V.
Thompson, G. Stanley
Thompson, Harry T.
Thompson, J. W., K.C.
Thompson, Murray O.
Thomson, James H.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tilston, Charles E.
Timms, Arthur P.
Tinning, Stanley E.
Tolchard, F. D.
Tory, J. S. D.
Tosevic, Dimitri J.
Townley, N. A.
Trafford-Owen, Lt.-Col. A. E.
Traviss, James A.
Trow, Dr. E. J.
Tudhope, H. R.
Turner, E. H.
Turner, James, C.A.
Turville, Frank D.
Tuteur, Col. M. P.

Udell, F. E.
Upshall, Walter P.
Urquhart, Norman C.

Van Koughnet, Arthur
Van Nest, F. J.
Van Nostrand, C. I.
Vanstone, B. S.
Varty, W. George
Vaughan, J. J.
Vaughan, J. W.
Venning, H. T.
Vipond, Gordon
Virgin, W. H.
Virtue, Roy A.

Waddell, J. C.
Waddington, F. G.
Wagner, William A.
Wainwright, A. L.
Waldie, R. S.
Waldron, Keith S.
Waldruff, E. H.
Walker, Aitken
Walker, D. R.
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Walker, William
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walters, Chester
Walters, Fred Y.
Walton, George E.
Ward, Rev. Canon J. E.
Wardle, T. A.
Wardropper, J.
Warmoll, C. R.
Warren, Dr. C. A.
Warren, Ernest A.
Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, George R.
Waters, W. Keith
Waterston, Lt.-Col. E. T. (S.A.)
Watkins, William B.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Colonel W. H.
Watt, Gordon C.
Weale, W. H.
Weeks, A. L.
Welch, Frank
Welch, Frank E.
Welch, H. J., F.C.A.
Wells, E. F.
Wemp, Major Bert S.
Wessels, R. S.
West, Reg. C.
Weston, J. F.
Westren, John
Whidden, Dr. Howard P.
White, R. B.
White, Sir Thomas
Whiteley, J.

Whittaker, Harry
Wilbur, G. P.
Wildridge, S. L.
Wilkes, Lt.-Col. F. Hilton
Wilkins, Cyril H.
Wilkinson, E. H.
Wilkinson, Rev. Canon F. H. M.A., B.D.
Wilkinson, R.
Wilkinson, W. J.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, Frank D.
Williams, Dr. J. J.
Williams, Dr. J. P. F.
Williams, R. Massey
Williams, R. T.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willmot, Fred G.
Willoughby, J. A.
Willoughby, V. W.
Wilson, Alex.
Wilson, A. E.
Wilson, Alex. L.
Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, Hugh
Winchell, L. F.
Winter, L. A.
Wolfson, Norman
Wood, L. M.
Wood, R. J.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H.F.D.
Woodland, J. C.
Wright, D. G. H.
Wright G. K.
Wright, Capt. Palmer
Wright, Peter
Wright, W. A.
Wrong, Dr. Norman
Wyatt H. L.
Wynston, Arthur L.

Young, Cyril T.
Young Col. E. J.
Young, H. G.
Young, John A.
Young, Reginald L.
Young, T. S.
Young, W. T.